OTHER WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR:

The Science of the Emotions. 2nd Edition.

The Science of Peace.

The Science of Government; or, The Laws of Manu in the Light of Theosophy.

THE SCIENCE OF THE SACRED WORD

BEING A SUMMARISED TRANSLATION

OF

THE PRANAVA-VADA

OF

GARGYAYANA

BY

BHAGAVAN DAS

with notes by Annie Besant and an Appendix by
Louise Appel, M.B., B.S., B.Sc.

VOL. I.

THE *THEOSOPHIST* OFFICE, Adyar, Madras, S., India.

THE THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING SOCIETY

161, New Bond Street, London, W., and Benares City, India.

1910

PRINTED BY ANNIE BESANT, AT THE VASANṬĀ PRESS, ADYAR.

CONTENTS

The Strange Story of a Hidden Book

PRANAVA-VADA

VOL. I.

THE STRANGE STORY OF A HIDDEN BOOK

I.

A STORY

A GREAT land, and a great race living its large life thereon: majestic mountains crowned with silent snows; encircling seas; vast gorges in which torrents lost themselves; forests of stately trees and flowering plants and creepers in festoons; broad-rolling rivers; awesome cataracts, dazzling cascades and sprayful waterfalls; incessant-brawling brooks and limpid rills and rivulets; all teeming with wild life, gentle and innocent or mighty and compelling, gorgeous insects, flashing fish, and birds and beasts of high and low degree—all the poetry of living nature:

Great temples; beautiful homes, full-spaced; broad paths; fair market-places; uḍyānas, pleasure-parks and bathing ṭīrṭhas; raṅgas, places of plays and poems, palaces of art, kalā-gṛhas; chariots and cars; bulls and dromedaries of the finest breeds, and elephants and horses trained and beautified with utmost skill—all the poetry of life-enhancing art:

Peace and contentment; mutual help and love and service; stately courtesies and ways of gracefulness; well-balanced, well-divided industry and ease; all-rounded knowledge; scripture chant and high and holy hymn—all the poetry of human life was there.

Strong and fair and youthful were the bodies of the race. But the Jīvas were very old, and long experience in their many previous births had taught them well how sin was ever hunted down and torn in pieces by sure misery. And sinless therefore was the race. And, therefore, too, the Earth's benignity flowed forth to it in unchecked plenty. As the men were just and gentle to each other and to all beings, so the elemental gods that ever give to men what they desire and deserve, shaping their ways to men's deserts and wishes, were also clement unto them. And Mother Earth took pleasure in her children, and, in her vast and joyful dance around the sun, bore her rounded body so that all physical circumstances of wind and wave and sunshine were adjusted to their comfort, and they were happy even as yearling babes rolling and leaping in their mother's lap.

And so that happy elder race lived its large life. But a day came when they should pass away to other worlds and new experiences.

A deep and solemn forest of gigantic pines on a great mountain slope within the land. A hermitage of peace and calm and quiet. A hoary sage and students young and old in a large number.

"My children," said the sage, "the time has come when our race, having lived its appointed round of experiences here, must pass further onwards. You, who are the youngest of the race, are not yet fit to pass on with it. Your studies are not yet complete, and more experience has to be gathered by you all. Your faculties are not all evenly developed and well balanced. Some have grown in power and action greatly; others have grown in noble feeling of emotion; others yet are working for a newer and a larger life of subtler senses for acquiring knowledge, and of finer instruments for doing action. But not until there is a union and a perfect balance of all the three constituents of the Jīva's life on one plane, may it progress into another plane efficiently.

"This balance and perfection are not gained till Jīvas do attain the middle point of the life of that plane and pass, through a vairāgya and a surfeit that includes all the selfish pleasures of that plane, into touch with the All-Self-Consciousness, and thereby learn to live for others than their own particular selves. Therefore your future destiny is that you shall work as pioneers of

a still younger race of Jīvas, that shall gradually be born within the land, heralding its arrival by great wars and times of much disquiet and unrest, and shall take possession of the flesh-houses left by the present race for their benefit. You too shall take birth again and again amongst them, and in the teaching and serving of them shall you yourselves learn and advance. And older ones from us shall not be absent. They shall remain behind as may be necessary, and watch and help and guide as may be fit.

"The great store of knowledge gathered by this older race for the profit of humanity shall lie hidden for long ages in such manner that it shall not be gained easily by those that would misuse it. But yet shall true and earnest seekers never fail to find it. Public spread thereof will be only when, and be only to the degree that, the elements of unity and harmony in the new race predominate over the elements of separation and discord, and a fair number of that race find conditions favorable enough for searching publicly for it, and give the guarantee, by their good life, that they shall use the knowledge well.

"Ye shall know the arrival of that time when the older and younger among you, born in different physical races, shall recognise your common spiritual ancestry and come together

and work together openly, making no distinction of outer caste or creed or colour or race or sex; and some shall bring to that inner commonwealth an independent re-discovery of some of these large truths of physical science that now are known to you, and some of metaphysic and psychology and ethic, and others of knowledge through the superphysical senses of the superphysical planes, and some shall be taught directly by the elders staying behind, and others shall carry away entire and by sheer force of strong memory, whole works in sacred Samskṛṭ lying hidden purposely in families selected for the keeping of them thus. And so, with spread of knowledge, spread of love, and spread of mutual help, a happier time shall come over the suffering lands and men shall join to form a new race in imitation of the present, and haply rise to greater heights even than this! So, fare ye well!"

If thy Soul is sad within thee,
  Hung'ring, thirsting, after peace,
Come with me, belov'd! believe me,
  Read, I promise, doubts shall cease.

When the Master gave the secret,
  "'Tis the last in terms of sound,"
So he said, and "Go, proclaim it,
  Say the lost word has been found.

They who list' and ponder deeply,
  They shall find all life made new
By this sweet voice of the silence,
  Wisdom's dawn on pity's dew.

Knowing this, the Final Knowledge,
  Seek whate'er ye wish and find.
For the mind that knoweth truly
  Must have left ill wish behind.

And to him who wisheth rightly,
  Not for self but for the race,
Aye the Guardians of the Wisdom
  Show the Glories of Its Face.

Ask of Air and Fire and Water
  And the Holy Ones of Earth
For the secrets held for seekers
  Who have found the second birth—

Not that *ye* may have the secrets,
  But for all pure souls are one,
And that so may fuller service
  To our suffering race be done.

And, lest even now ye falter,
  Fix gaze on what brooks no seeing,
Ever list' to what is Soundless
  Hold fast That which hath no being!"

II.

A HISTORY

PAṆḌIṬ ḌHANARĀJA

In the winter of 1896-1897, being then in the service of the Government of India, and posted, with judicial and revenue duties, at the town of Bārābaṅkī (near Lucknow, the famous capital of the Indian province of Oudh), I came across Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja, at the house of Paṇḍiṭ Parmeshrī Ḍās, a practising lawyer and pleader for Government in the Court of Wards Department, a grey-haired fellow-member of the Theosophical Society (repeatedly mentioned in Colonel Olcott's *Old Diary Leaves*) and a dear friend who has now passed away (in October 1908). The impressions that I then received as to Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja were described by me at the time in letters to my elder brother, Bābū Govinḍa Ḍās (then an Honorary Magistrate and Municipal Commissioner in Benares), and a great hunter after and collector of rare Samskṛṭ manuscripts. Extracts from these letters were published by him in the *Prashnoṭṭara* (now called *Theosophy in India*), the monthly organ of the Indian Section of the Theosophical Society, for the months of March, April, and May, 1897. Portions of these extracts were copied in the *Lucifer* (afterwards THE THEOSOPHICAL REVIEW) of London, for May,

1897. I think it best, on the whole, for the purposes of this narrative, to reprint the extracts here, though they are scarcely written in a style suitable for publication.

EXTRACTS FROM THE PRASHNOṬṬARA
(*Extracts from some Private Letters*)

[NOTE.—The following three extracts from private letters are printed in the hope that members situated favourably and having local facilities may try their hands and fortune at MS.-hunting in the districts of Gorakhpur and Basṭī. Many members have had the opportunity of making the acquaintance of Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja, referred to in these extracts, at the last Annual Convention of the Indian Section held at Benares in October, 1896, and will probably remember him.—SUB-ED.]

AN OLD-WORLD PAṆḌIṬ

. . . . Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja is blind of both eyes; he is scarcely twenty years old; yet it is calculated that he carries in his memory a mass of Samskṛṭ literature equal to about thirty *Mahābhāraṭas* in bulk. The statement is not easily believable, especially when we are told that this mass comprises writings on all subjects—the 'original' works on Grammar by Maheshvara (Shiva), on Kosha (Lexicography) by Gaṇesha, on Chhanḍah (Metre) by Vishṇu, on Cosmogony by Kṛshṇa, etc., etc. And yet I am convincing

myself gradually that the statement represents ... ... truth. I say I am convincing myself gradually, for I freely confess that I am not quite convinced yet.

Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja says that from the age of about five upwards he has been doing nothing else than 'committing to memory' at an average rate of about 1,000 shlokas every day. His work ceased about a year or so ago; and he is now setting about to digest and assimilate his vast mental meal. He studied at the house of a family of Paṇḍiṭs in his native village, where the paramparā, succession, has come down, and where the books are yet found, the very names of which have been long forgotten by, and are now unknown to, the modern generation of Paṇḍiṭs.

From glimpses afforded by Ḍhanarāja, the older books, put side by side with the vast waste and desert of words called the modern Samskṛṭ literature known to us—*Vyākaraṇa* and *Nyāya*, and even the greater portion of *Veḍānṭa* and *Sāṅkhya* and *Veḍa*-commentary and *Mīmāmsā* and *Ḍharma-Shāsṭra*, etc., etc., including books plagiarised, books bodily stolen, books written in pure spite and intolerance, and books written for mere display of learning—appear to be as well-cultivated gardens full of healthy flower and fruit and fragrance beside the desert sands of Sahara.

I do not mean to say that what is now available to the general public does not contain . . . that which will bring peace to the mind of the man tossed with doubts, philosophy proper. This has been left by a kind destiny, though it is enveloped in and surrounded by an immense mass of verbiage on other subjects. But the next degree of literature . . . on the secret sciences and on Physiology, Chemistry, Astronomy, etc., etc., has disappeared and carried off with it all the r a h a s y a, secret, of them.

The modern disciple of Pāṇinī, with much waste of ingenuity and endeavour to "touch the nose round the back of the head," as the Hinḍī proverb says, will explain at some pages' length why the "i" sound followed by the "u" sound amalgamates with the latter into the "yu" sound. Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja says that the older Grammar gives the *physiological* reason why.

The magnificent hymn, in the *Ḍurgā-Sapṭa-shaṭī*, by the rescued Ḍevas to the victorious Goddess, is in the Vāsanṭa-ṭilakā metre. The modern metrist has nothing more to say as to why that particular metre was used, than that such was the whim of the author, or at most that the rules of propriety required it. Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja explains that the old books say that in the ā r ṭ a or painful and refuge-seeking state of mind the Ḍevas were then in, the Maḍhyamā and Sainḍhavī (nerves belonging to the apparatus

of articulation apparently) are affected and come into play, with the consequence that the sounds uttered can take no other metrical arrangement than the "Vasanṭa-ṭilakā." Possibly the full explanation is based deep down on the physics and mathematics of sound, but even this much *sounds* very useful.

The promises held out, then, are great. It would be well indeed if they were realised. But the difficulties are many. The MSS. out of which Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja was taught are unavailable. They are kept away with jealous care from the reach of the inquisitive public. And Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja, though willing to dictate all he has in his memory, cannot be provided with a writer sufficiently fast to reduce any tolerable portion of his stores into writing. Paṇḍiṭ Parmeshrī Ḍās, who has been recently contributing to the *Theosophist* some articles on the older Grammar, etc., with the help of this marvellous Paṇḍiṭ, is doing all he can in the matter, but however thankful we may be for what he has done we cannot but feel that it is not enough by far. If some system of short-hand Ḍevanāgarī could be devised by a Theosophical brother sufficiently ingenious, it would be a great help indeed—though we must always be prepared for disappointment even after all these old books have become l i p i (writing) from S m ṛ ṭ i (memory). Such disappointment is by no means the

unfrequent lot of Theosophical students! The first view has often aroused surging hopes of the promised land of milk and honey; while a nearer view has often dissipated the illusion and shown that that first spectacle was a mere mirage indeed.

AN OLD-WORLD PAṆDIṬ'S LIST
OF OLD-WORLD BOOKS

. . . I asked Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja to give me a list of the 'real, original' works (Mūla-Granṭhas) on every subject treated of in the Samskṛṭ tongue—a list that should form a complete Encyclopædia of Samskṛṭ learning in all departments into which such learning had extended (which, according to Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja, means all departments whatsoever of possible human knowledge, of course!). I added, as a condition, that the list should be self-complete, such that the fortunate possessor of the books mentioned therein should be independent of other help for intelligence of them. And the Paṇḍiṭ readily gave me such a list out of a work by Gobhila, called *Shāsṭrānubhava*, wherein, he said, such a list had already been framed and put away. I reproduce the list below:—

I.—*Shabḍa-Shāsṭra* (the Science of Sounds).

	Granṭha-saṅkhyā (In numbers of Shloka-measures)
1. *Vyākaraṇa* (Grammar)	
Sūṭras, by Maheshvara } Bhāṣhya, by Nāraḍa } . . .	100,000

2. *Kosha* (Etymology and Dictionary)

Nirukṭa, by Gaṇesha } Bhāṣhya, by Sheṣha } . .	55,000

3. *Chhanḍah* (Metre)

Chhanḍārṇava, by Viṣhṇu . .	172,000

4. *Jyoṭiṣha* (Astronomy and Astrology)

Bṛhaḍāṅka-praḍīpṭa, by Sūrya .	100,000

5. *Shīkṣhā* (Philology, etc.)

Shīkṣhā, by Maheshvara } Bhāṣhya, by Nāraḍa } . .	90,000

6. *Kalpa* (the Science of "Constructions")

Vyavasṭhānubheḍa, by Ḍevī . .	248,000

(*Jyoṭiṣha* forms part of Shabḍa-Shāsṭra for some mysterious reasons, which Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja promises to explain at future leisure. A shloka-measure means thirty-two syllables.)

II.—*Ḍarshana* (Philosophy)

1. *Veḍānṭa.*

Prāhikṣha-Praḍīpa, by Brahmā .	436,000

2. *Sāṅkhya.*

Anubhava, by Marīchi . . .	308,000

3. *Nyāya.*

Prabhānṭarikṣha, by Svayambhū .	215,000

4. *Mīmāmsa.*

Arṭhaprakāsha, by Aṅgirāh . .	205,000

5. *Vaisheṣhika.*

Ḍarshanānubhava, by Kraṭu . .	275,000

6. *Yoga.*

Vṛṭṭyājiṭārṇava, by Chyamana .	150,000

III.—*Smṛṭi* (Law)

Manusmṛṭi	24,000

IV.—*Veḍa*

1. Ṛk-Samhiṭā	432,000	Ṛchās
28 Brāhmaṇas	75,000	Shlokas
42 Upaniṣhaṭs	200,000	„
2. Yajus-Samhiṭā	250,000	Ṛchās
22 Brāhmaṇas	100,000	Shlokas
60 Upaniṣhaṭs	105,000	„

3. Sāma-Samhiṭā	. . . . . .	600,000 Ṛchās
21 Brāhmaṇas	. . . . .	150,000 Shlokas
90 Upanishaṭs	. . . . .	200,000 ,,
4. Aṭharva-Samhiṭā	. . . . .	300,000 Ṛchās
11 Brāhmaṇas	. . . . .	80,000 Shlokas
52 Upanishaṭs	. . . . .	100,000 ,,

UPAVEḌA

V.—*Āyurveḍa* (Medicine)

Chakrānuvesha by Sanaka 392,000

VI.—*Ḍhanurveḍa* (Archery)

Praveshāsṭra-Prakāsha, by Pracheṭāh 300,000

VII.—*Gānḍharva-veḍa* (Music)

Svarānuvāḍa, by Nāraḍa 136,000

VIII.—*Kāraṇyopaveḍa*

Siḍḍhānṭopanyasṭa, by Ashvinī-Kumāra . 432,000

(This, the fourth Upaveḍa, is said to comprise the sciences of commerce, agriculture, cattle, architecture, law, etc., *i.e.*, briefly, all things relating to man's social life. The current name is Sṭhapāṭya or *Shilpopaveḍa*.)

IX.—*Kāma Shāsṭra* (The Science of Love)

Ḍehiṭānubhava, by Pulasṭya . . . 150,000

The above list exhausts all the four 'objects of human life,' Ḍharma, Arṭha, Kāma, and Moksha.

Printed in royal 8vo volumes of 800 pages each, every page containing fifteen shlokas on an average—this total of 6,380,700 shlokas would form a compact little library of 500 volumes, roughly; nothing surprising, by any means, seeing that twenty times that number of volumes is disgorged annually by the press of

England alone! But what *is* surprising is that Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja, while modestly denying that he has the whole by heart, yet admits that he carries in his memory at least a good two-thirds of it, besides another ten lakhs or so in miscellaneous literature, novels and histories (yes, *novels* and *histories*) and Purāṇas and modern works!

Let us see if Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja can justify his statements, and make good his promise to a wondering and grateful humanity, or whether we are forced to content ourselves in the end with saying that the Paṇḍiṭ said things that were not true, and that his were mere words. . .

THE LAST OF THE OLD-WORLD PAṆḌIṬS?

. . . Old MS.-hunter as you are, did you not look with longing eyes at the list I sent you last? ...What hopes...it must have aroused! What ideas of revolutionising Oriental scholarship, of giving an irresistible impulse to the study of Samskṛṭ all over the world, of helping the young and growing races of the West! To a child of India it must seem that a discovery of such records would be pregnant with much more profit and use than the treasures of literature which King Menelik of Abyssinia has recently promised to throw open to the research of western scholars within his dominions. Alas! the profit and the use that there may be, will be for Europe, juvenescent and vigorous, not for

our superannuated race now in the senility and dotage that precede death. Her scientists would make each hint the starting point of a new science, the counterpart of which we had, perhaps, but have no more. This is but as it should be. Every fact is its own best justification. The fact that arts and sciences have been lost, and the books that described and taught them gone out of sight, in itself shows clearly that the race has deteriorated and grown weak and unfit to possess them. What is left to do is to help as far as may be to transfer the spirit of the dying giant to the thriving babe.

> The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
> And God fulfils Himself in many ways.

And we ought loyally to help on the new ways. . . . So I have been digressing and building castles in the air which, as in others, so in this case, have to end in disillusionment (for which I have already prepared you) and vanish like the fabric of a vision, but not exactly without leaving a wrack behind. Circumstances have occurred which have given rise to grave doubts as to the ability of Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja to "justify the ways" of himself "to men." Alas! for the old, old perversity of the human mind that made Ḍhṛṭarāṣhtra cry out: "I know the right and yet cannot abide therein; I know the wrong and yet cannot refrain therefrom." While talking so profusely of the wondrous

hidden store of lore on every matter of interest to humanity, he seems to be very chary of giving the clue to where it may be found. To take down whole works to his dictation seems a very long and desolately laborious task. But even that has been attempted by Paṇḍiṭ Parmeshrī Ḍās, for nothing is too difficult for the labour of love; and many works have been so begun, amongst them a marvellous *Bhāṣhya* on the *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*, professing to explain much of the esoteric meaning thereof, by the same Gobhila as has been mentioned before as the author of *The Survey of Samskṛṭ Literature,* out of which the list has been given to you, but somehow or other none of them has been finished, with the single exception of a *Sāmyāyana Kosha,* which has been completed in 8,000 and odd shlokas, taken down to dictation from the lips of the Paṇḍiṭ. This last work is a sort of lexicon and book of rules as to how works and words are to be interpreted, with reference to the special subject they treat of, the time and place and other circumstances they appertain to, the persons they are addressed by and to, etc., etc. But the misfortune as regards this single work that *is said* by the Paṇḍiṭ to have been completed, as well as with regard to the many other works which have been begun but never finished, is that the style is more often than not so entirely "archaic" (to put the matter

most mildly), that it is impossible for an ordinary layman, whose scholarship extendeth not beyond the range of modern Samskṛṭ, to say whether the collocation of letters carries any sense at all in it or is mere 'abracadabra'.

But whatever the value of this particular man and his statements may be, there is little doubt—as I have learnt from independent sources also—that old and valuable MSS. and great learning do exist in the country "beyond the Sharayū," forming the districts of Gorakhpur and Basṭī, and that there is a race of Paṇḍiṭs dwelling scattered over that tract, who, unlike the Paṇḍiṭs of most of our cities, are not forced to make of their knowledge their sole means of livelihood, but, possessing independent means, as small land-owners or large cultivators, prosecute their studies amongst themselves in that right spirit of love and reverence of learning for the sake of learning which is its best and tenderest fosterer, though most unfortunately under the vow, it seems, that they will not impart their knowledge to any other than a Sharayū-pārīṇa Brāhmaṇa. We may and do regret the vow in the interests of the world at large, but I cannot but admire the principle that prompts it. ... ...

The above extracts show amply the indecisiveness of the impressions then produced on me by the personality and the conversation of Paṇḍiṭ

Ḍhanarāja. To these I now add an account of the troubles and tantalisations undergone by Paṇḍiṭ Parmeṣhrī Ḍās on account of this phenomenal person, whom he was the first to discover for practical purposes. Of course I had had many talks with him about the matter previously, but I took down from his mouth, systematically, for this introduction, a complete account of his experiences from the very beginning up to date, on the 25th October, 1903, when he was in Benares, on a short visit. He gave the account in Hinḍī, from which I put it in English.

PAṆḌIṬ PARMESHRĪ ḌĀS' NARRATIVE

I FIRST began to take an interest in the Samskṛṭ language in 1894, so far as I can remember, when I was about fifty years of age, after coming across an account, in a newspaper, of a lecture by Mrs. Besant, delivered in Calcutta, wherein she strongly advocated the study of Samskṛṭ.

My beginnings were very modest. I began, indeed, with Ḍevanāgarī and the Hinḍī vernacular, which I did not know well, having studied Urḍū and Persian at school and college. From Hinḍī and Ḍevanāgarī I passed on to Samskṛṭ, taking up the *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭa* to begin with, naturally, as will be easily understood.

The difficulties I met with in properly understanding the language of the *Gīṭā* compelled me to think of studying Samskṛṭ grammar. I

went to a Shāsṭrī, teaching in a local school, and promptly got by heart the first fourteen sūṭras of Pāṇinī, reported by tradition to have been received by him direct from Shiva after much penance and propitiation, and forming the foundation of the rest of Pāṇinī's grammar.

But now arose a difficulty. The misfortune of having been a practising lawyer for over twenty years, at the time I engaged the Shāsṭrī to help me across the depths of Samskṛṭ grammar, compelled me to ask him why there were only fourteen sūṭras and not fifteen or thirteen; why there were only so many vowels and so many consonants, and not more or less; why, even amongst those that were enumerated in these aphorisms, the particular order observed had been followed, why *a* preceded, and *i* followed and *u* succeeded, etc.

The Shāsṭrī came to a standstill. I tried to pull him along a little further; but our mutual perplexities became more and more tangled every day. I sought other help. The same results. My collection of Samskṛṭ grammars, old and new, eastern and western, grew more and more complete. So did my discontent with them. The thing weighed on me like a nightmare. Why *were* there only and exactly fourteen aphorisms and forty-two (or counting also the repetition of one) forty-three letters enumerated in them, and why *were* they arranged in that

particular order? My very sleep was affected. My daily prayers began to include a petition for help on this particular point!

Months passed. It was June of 1894, I believe, and I was still rubbing my eyes in bed early one morning, preparatory to getting up, when I was informed that two men had arrived at the house, one of them blind, and that they wanted to see me. Against my usual custom, I went straight from my bed to the doorway of the house. I saw two men. One was under twenty, possibly not more than eighteen, blind of both eyes, one eye sunken, the other bulging with a sightless, distorted and swollen eyeball. The other man was of almost the same age. Neither had anything else on than a loin-cloth. I asked them who they were and what they wanted.

"We want a meal and enough money to carry us to Cawnpore."

"Are you literate?"

The blind man said: "Yes."

"What have you studied?"

"Samskṛṭ."

"Why are you going to Cawnpore?"

"I hope to get some work there in connection with the Ārya-Samāj."

"What emoluments?"

"Rs. 5 or Rs. 7 *per mensem* for a teachership."

"Do you know the *Siḍḍhānṭa-Kaumuḍī*?"

"Yes."

"All right; I will see you again; rest and eat in the meanwhile."

The blind man gave his name as Ḍhanarāja, and that of his companion as Chanḍra Bhāla.

I saw them again in the afternoon, and we had some little talk on Samskṛṭ grammar. We met again in the evening. Then I could not wait any longer and propounded my standing difficulty.

The blind man said: "Yes, I can answer all your questions."

"Out of your own intelligence, or from some old book?"

"From old books." This was good news. "But," he added, "I have not got the books; I only know them by heart."

A few days later, after he had settled himself in the house, I began taking down to his dictation a series of Samskṛṭ verses, mostly in the *anuṣhtup* metre. I took down about 1,500. They constituted a dialogue between Shiva and Pārvaṭī, in which the latter asked the very same questions that had been puzzling me, and the former answered them in a way that was quite satisfactory to me, at least, and at the time.

I do not now remember whether he mentioned the name of this work, but he said that it was complete in those 1,500 couplets. He added, however, on further inquiry, that if I wanted more details on Samskṛṭ grammar I should find

them in complete fulness in the *Nāraḍīya-Bhāṣhya* on the *Māheshvara-Vyākaraṇa.*

I had been also studying pieces of the *Sīḍḍhānṭa-Kaumuḍī,* relating to s a n ḍ h i (the coalescence of letters and sounds) with the man, all the while becoming more and more discontented with the v ṛ ṭ ṭ i s (explanations of Pāṇinī's aphorisms) contained in the work, and obtaining better explanations from the blind Paṇḍiṭ himself, out of his mnemonic resources, as regards the physiological reasons for these coalescences. I preserved notes of these perpetual "whys" of mine and "becauses" of his.

My next manuscript-enterprise was more ambitious. I began writing to Ḍhanarāja's dictation the *Nāraḍīya-Bhāṣhya,* which he said, extended over 60 or 62,000 couplets, all verse. I took down about 500 or 600 of these.

Then I began to question him about the *Māheshvara-Vyākaraṇa* (of which the *Nāraḍīya-Bhāṣhya* was said by him to be an extended commentary). He began to dictate and I to write. To the best of my recollection, he said there were 5,000 aphorisms in the work. I wrote down about a thousand. I found that the order and arrangement of the sub-divisions of the subject was exactly the same as in the modern *Siḍḍhānṭa-Kaumuḍī.* But the aphorisms were entirely diffierent, and the illustrations and examples were all Vaiḍika-looking, and very

numerous and lengthy, and full of compounds difficult to pronounce. In connection with this difficulty of pronunciation, after giving me a number of inconsistent replies, first saying that the current *Shikṣhā* (a set of rules for pronunciation, etc., forming a sort of supplement to the current grammar) was genuine, and then that the one published by Ḍayānanḍa Sarasvaṭī (the founder of the Ārya Samāj) was genuine, he ultimately said that the original *Shikṣhā* written by Pāṇini was different from both.

I wrote down this *Shikṣhā,* extending to over 100 shlokas, and said by the Paṇḍiṭ to be complete in that number.

I also employed, about this time, another Paṇḍiṭ, and got him to write down a *Bhāṣhya* (commentary) on this *Shikṣhā,* consisting of extracts of the best portions of eight different commentaries. This *Bhāṣhya* is also complete excepting the last five or six shlokas. All this, of course, was dictated also by Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja, and all from memory, as he said.

The year 1894 came to an end with this.

I asked Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja how he came to find the *Nāraḍīya-Bhāṣhya.*

He said: "Our family are residents of the village of Belhar Kalāñ, in Ṭahsīl Khalīlābāḍ of the Basṭī District (in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, India). My grandfather was a very learned Paṇḍiṭ. He had a great taste

for studying and teaching ancient works. His collection of MSS. is still with us. He kept up a private Pāthashālā (school). He was very fond of *Sannyāsīs* (wandering ascetics). One day, when I was about twelve or thirteen, there came a *Sannyāsī* who was very much struck with my exceptional memory, for I could get almost 1,000 couplets by heart in a single day. He taught me the *Nāraḍīya-Bhāṣhya.* I had an elder cousin, now dead, who had not lost his eyesight, as I did at two and a half years of age from small-pox; and he had even a greater retentiveness. He also committed the *Nāṛaḍīya-Bhāṣhya* to memory."

At the close of 1894, Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja went back to his village. He returned again, after an absence of a few weeks, at the end of January, 1895. This time he came with changed ways, always trying to evade dictation and avoid talk on the matters in which I was most interested. However, I got him to dictate some old *sṭoṭras* (hymns) to me. Then, one day in the course of conversation, he mentioned that in a work called the *Nārṇava*[1], a dialogue between Kṛṣhṇa and Uḍḍhava, there was a statement that Ṛṣhis would continue to dwell on the Himālayas throughout the Kaliyuga and be the custodians

[1] "The ocean of Na, the Negation," for explanation of which Negation, see the text of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa.*—B. D.

of all knowledge after Kṛshṇa's departure from this earth.

I forthwith began to reduce the *Nārṇava* into writing, having succeeded in inducing Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja to dictate it. We proceeded to about 500 shlokas, the whole being declared by him to be many thousands. I forget the exact number.

Then, one night I asked him if he had ever studied the small *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā* too, amidst all these huge performances. He said "No." Then I said: "You ought to study it now."

So we began, I this time acting as dictator and he as memoriser. I taught him about eight or ten shlokas, he repeating them faithfully after me, at first in a halting manner, and then over and over again, exactly imitating the process by which a child commits lessons to memory.

By and by it was decided that Ḍhanarāja and I and another friend should spend some time every day on the *Gīṭā* and endeavour to discover esoteric meanings therein, out of our own unaided intelligences, and write them down in the vernacular (Hinḍī). Well, I led off with guesses, based on Theosophical literature, which I had been reading steadily.

Ḍhanarāja said: "Yes, this is so." I asked: "Why do you speak in this *imprimatur* style?" After many days' haggling he repeated shlokas, from some *Kosha* (Dictionary or Thesaurus)

saying that they proved authoritatively that the *Gīṭā*-words had that particular meaning. I asked: "Why then bother our heads unnecessarily? If you have got an appropriate *Kosha*, specially fitted for this purpose, you can go along interpreting the *Gitā* far more easily." He said he had been repeating from a *Bhāṣhya* on the *Nirukṭa*, the *Kosha* of the *Veḍa*.

We began anew with this help. After we had struggled on to the seventh or eighth verse of the first chapter of the *Gīṭā*, Ḍhanarāja admitted that he knew the book very well and many *Bhāṣhyas* also on it, including one by Gobhila. The pretence of ignorance was only a hoax!

We began the *Gobhilīya-Bhāṣhya* on the *Gīṭā* and, for a wonder, finished it too! People who will take the necessary trouble to put themselves mentally in my circumstances of age, life-long habits, heavy legal occupations, insufficient knowledge of Samskṛṭ, eagerness to know more and inability to spare the necessary time and energy for systematic study from the beginning like a young tyro, and the wonderful nature of the entirely new world of literature opened up, will not wonder that I made so many beginnings and so few endings, and that I was always wandering off into alluring digressions. They will rather wonder that I completed the few MSS. that I did.

My previous familiarity with the subject-

matter of the *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā* and my great respect for the work, the Hinḍūs' Bible, and the interest of the commentary itself, took me right through the whole of this great work. Not having learnt Samskṛṭ or practised Ḍevanāgarī-writing in my earlier years, I have never made myself a good caligraphist of that character. Yet I, with my own hand, laboriously inscribed the bulk of the book. The rest was written by two other writers whom I employed. And the bulk is large; the complete work measures about 24,000 shlokas (of thirty-two syllables each.) This performance occupied us three whole years—1895-6-7.

But while our energies were mainly directed to this work during this period, digressions were not wanting, as was inevitable from my endless queries. A piece of a *Vyārṇava-Samhiṭā*—a dialogue between Kṛṣhṇa and Rukviṇī (that is Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja's spelling, the current one being Rukmiṇī) on all matters in heaven and earth, said to be complete in about 14,000 shlokas—was put on paper.[1] A *Sāmyāyana-Kosha*—an independent lexicon in about 8,000 verses, by Vyāsa, was so fortunate as to get completed. And the 'real original' *Vaiḍika Nirukṭa* with a *Bhāṣhya* was also begun. Of

[1] About 800 shlokas of this were written down by me, in the course of some holidays during my stay at Bārābaṅkī.—B. D.

course all this was done to the dictation from memory (as he alleged), of the blind Paṇḍiṭ, who is also the sole authority for the descriptions and epithets used, as to whether a work was or was not completed, whether it was genuine, etc., or not.

In 1896 Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja attended the Annual Convention of the Theosophical Society, held at Benares; and with his help I contributed some articles on Samskṛṭ grammar to *The Theosophist*, during the three years 1895-6-7.

At the end of 1897, Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja went away for a long period. But he did not go to his home. He went and stayed with the Rājā of Haḍahā, close to Bārābaṅkī. He stayed with him almost throughout the whole of 1898, coming to see me now and then for a few days only at a time. I, too, suffered from unhappy family bereavements in that year, and no work could be done with Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja. The year 1899 also passed similarly. Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja was wandering about elsewhere, coming to see me now and then. In 1900 he stayed with me for almost a month in the summer, when we did some sporadic work on the 'real, original' *Bhāṣhya*[1] on the *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭa* by the 'real' original' Shaṅkarāchārya, the current one being

[1] The first hundred shloka-measures or so of this were written down by me on the 31st of July, 1900, when I was visiting Paṇḍiṭ Parmeshrī Dās, for a

decided by him to be spurious. We also did some miscellaneous hymns and sṭoṭras.

Then Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja went on to Benares, and dictated the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* there.[1]

He returned to Bārābaṅkī in the summer of 1901; and then dictated to me 700 shlokas of what he declared was the second half and continuation of the *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā* now current. The *Vyārṇava-Samhiṭā* was also continued with the help of a copyist.

We also began a *Bhāṣhya*, by Bārhāyaṇa, in 80,000 shlokas, on the 'original' *Brahma-Sūṭras*, numbering 10,000. By the end of February, 1902, we had progressed to the seventh or eighth sūṭra of the original and about the 3,000th shloka of the commentary. He left again and has not returned to me since. But he has been wandering about amongst other householders in the district of Bārābaṅkī, and I have met him also at one or two places casually.

At the end of these eight years of acquaintance, this extraordinary man still remains a puzzle to me, notwithstanding the fact that he has lived in the same house, almost in the same room, with me, night and day, for months and months together. If all he says about himself; his

---

day at Bārābaṅkī; they seemed to be a sort of abstract of the alleged *Gobhilīya-Bhāṣhya* of the *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*.—B. D.

[1] To me, as will be described later on.—B. D.

memory; the hundreds of ancient works of which nobody in the outside world knows anything at all; his memorial knowledge of them all, comprising perhaps two million couplets of thirty-two syllables each (I have and have had taken down some 60,000, and you, Bhagavān Ḍās, 16,000); amongst them such 'trifles' as fifty-two *Bhāṣhyas* on the *Giṭā*, four complete *Bhāṣhyas* on the 'complete' *Veḍas* (not the patches now extant) from beginning to end, all the eighteen *Purāṇas*, the 'real, original' ones, and the *Mahābhāraṭa*, with Gobhila's *Bhāṣhyas* on them all, full of wonderful 'esoteric' interpretations, the original *Sūṭras* of the six systems of philosophy and the six *Veḍāṅgas*, all with *Bhāṣhyas*, in fact works on all possible branches of science and philosophy; and all that he says about the secret handing-down of all such wondrous learning in old families of Paṇḍiṭs, in the Nepāl Ṭerāī and adjoining country—if all this, or a tenth or a hundredth of it, be true at all, then it is very, very wonderful.

Can we believe him or can we not? In all these eight years, he has never repeated a second time, despite incessant requests and offers of all kinds of inducements, honorary, pecuniary, etc., a single shloka that he has dictated once. He has evaded and avoided, equivocated and prevaricated; but never actually given this absolutely

simple and conclusive test of memory. He has failed most woefully in promises to show or secure MSS. of the works he dictated, which again would have settled all our doubts most satisfactorily. The majority of my friends, interested in these matters, who have come into contact with him, hold the strongest and most unfavourable opinion as to his straightforwardness in this respect. Indeed they do not hesitate to call him a charlatan; and it is difficult to prove them wrong.

I myself have been often driven to such irritation by his want of straightforwardness, that I have driven him out of my house—but always only to call him back again when the irritation subsided. And yet the fact of what he has dictated remains and stands invincibly. Has it or has it not any merits?

After eight years of work on it I am satisfied that a fair portion of it is new and valuable to modern thought. I have made many efforts to trace the MSS. of the works mentioned by Ḍhanarāja, with the help of occasional descriptions given by him as to the Paṇḍiṭ families with which, as he says, he stayed and studied the books he says he knows by heart. But I have always failed to lay my hand on any such substantial thing, partly, at least, I think, because of my very restricted opportunities for search. Yet I believe that the MSS. exist, for

I cannot believe, after what I have seen of Ḍhanarāja for eight years, that he has the power to invent all that he has dictated to me or my copyists. For the present, then, the people who take any serious interest in valuable philosophical thought must content themselves with judging these dictated works, and pieces of work, on their inherent merits. The future will show whether actual old MSS. justify this most wonderful man's statements.

---

c

Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja's Biography.

To the above I wished very much to add a full account of his life from the lips of Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja himself. But for reasons which will be partially understood from the latter portion of the narrative of Paṇḍiṭ Parmeshrī Ḍās, I have not succeeded in getting from Ḍhanarāja any such systematic account. If I do in future I will certainly publish it. In the meanwhile I am compelled to content myself with putting together such notes, either on paper or in memory, as I retain, of occasional talks about himself that Ḍhanarāja has indulged in in my hearing. Of course, the reliability of these talks is no greater, nor less, than that of his sayings and doings in general; and it is so defective, that I should ordinarily have refrained from publishing any of these matters. But the many years' experience of the man that Paṇḍiṭ Parmeshrī Ḍās and I have had, and his failure and mine (of which more will be said later) to trace or secure original MSS., and the utter uncertainty of my having better opportunities in the future, and the very great inherent merits, in our eyes, of the material dictated by the man, and finally the hope that others with better opportunities will take the work up,

and possibly bring to light this whole new world of very valuable literature for the use of humanity—all these considerations have combined to induce me not to delay publication of these matters any longer.

What I have gathered from Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja Mishra about his life is as follows:

He was born about 1873 A. D. in the village of Belhār Kalān, Post Office Menhḍāwal, Ṭahsīl Khalīlābāḍ, District Basṭī, United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, India. His father was Nepāl Mishra, uncle Paṭirāja Mishra, and grandfather Haragovinḍa Mishra. He had an elder brother, Chanḍrikā, who died at the age of sixteen or seventeen. (In Paṇḍiṭ Parmeshrī Ḍās' narrative this brother is mentioned as cousin.) Ḍhanarāja lost his eyesight from small-pox when he was two and a half or three years of age.

He had a phenomenal memory from his earliest childhood. When he was seven or eight years old, he could commit to memory many hundreds of shlokas in a single day. His brother Chanḍrikā was even better endowed. The family of Ḍhanarāja were grammarians. His grandfather kept a kind of private school (or day-pāthashālā), and taught deserving v i ḍ y ā r ṭ h ī s ('seekers of learning,' students). Ḍhanarāja early exhausted his family stores of modern Samskṛṭ grammar, and grew more and more dissatisfied and inquisitive.

Many Sannyāsīs (wandering ascetics) used to visit his grandfather. One of them was specially attracted by Ḍhanarāja's wonderful memory and inquisitiveness, and told him that he should study the *Maheshvarīya-Vyākaraṇa*, with the *Nāraḍīya-Bhāṣhya* on it, if he wanted his grammatical difficulties solved and his curiosity satisfied. Ḍhanarāja was eager to learn, and the Sannyāsī put him on the track. He told him the names of the Paṇḍiṭs and the places from whom and where he would get what he wanted.

Ḍhanarāja ran off from his home, accompanied and helped by a companion. (In Paṇḍiṭ Parmeshrī Ḍās' narrative Ḍhanarāja says he was taught the big work on grammar by the Sannyāsī himself.) His phenomenal memory, precocious intelligence, and developed inquisitiveness, were ready certificates of desert, and served as passports to the confidence of the Paṇḍiṭs mentioned by the Sannyāsī, and he began his astonishing career of memorising.

He went from one Paṇḍiṭ to another, from village to village, and district to district, obtaining clues to each successive house of learning from the previously visited one, all being occupied by members of the same ancient fraternity. (Some brief mention of them has been already made in the extracts reprinted from the *Prashnoṭṭara*.)

In this way he committed to memory some

hundreds of thousands, almost millions, of shloka-measures of literature (one shloka-measure being equal to thirty-two syllables). He wandered about thus for eight or ten years, and then felt surfeited. In the course of his wanderings he seems to have heard from some Paṇḍiṭs, who had been tried and found wanting, about Paṇḍiṭ Parmeshrī Ḍās' unanswerable questions. Here was a congenial spirit. In the spirit of the old *Upanishaṭ* stories he went to Paṇḍiṭ Parmeshrī Ḍās to answer his questions. What followed has already been described above.

From August 30th, 1900, to Janury 19th, 1901, he stayed with me at "Ḍurgākunḍ," Benares. In this period the *Praṇāva Vāḍa* was written down to his dictation, by me and Paṇḍiṭ Gaṅgānāṭh Jhā, M.A., D. Litt., (now Professor of Samskṛṭ, Muir Central College, Allahabāḍ); the last portion, about an eighth of the whole, being written by Paṇḍiṭ Ambā Ḍās of Benares (sometime head Pandiṭ in a Jaina Samskṛṭ Pāthashālā in Benares and now Professor of *Veḍānṭa* in the Raṇavīra Samskṛṭ Pāthashālā Department of the Central Hinḍū College, Benares). I have not seen him again since. I myself have not had the desired opportunity of going to his place and visiting the neighbouring tracts, and he has not been able to comply with my invitation to come and stay with me again. But I have had some correspondence,

very occasional and rare, with him since. I wrote to him repeatedly to send me an account of his life, written down to his dictation by some pupil of his; but he has not done so. He gave me some hopes of coming to me on a visit, in answer to repeated invitations, but these hopes have also remained unfulfilled so far. I might have got from him orally what he had not thought fit to send in writing.

I understand he has been married twice, the first wife having died.

I have made a list of the 'ancient' works of which he has spoken to my brother or myself from time to time during the months the *Praṇava Vāḍa* was being written, together with the names of the Paṇḍiṭs or others, and the places, with whom and where, according to him, manuscripts of them exist. Very much to my regret I have not had an opportunity, so far, of going out to search for them myself, personally, though I retain hopes of being able to do so some day, later on. But I have had search made for them, through friends residing in or near the localities concerned. All without success, so far. Either the villages do not exist, or at least cannot be traced and recognised; or, if the villages are found, then the Paṇḍiṭs named are not to be found there; or if both are found, then the Paṇḍiṭs swear that the MSS. named are not with them, and that they never even

heard of them; and so on. Perhaps others may take up the search and succeed better. The list is printed below for permanent record as a clue at least.

LIST OF INEXTANT SAMSKṚṬ WORKS MENTIONED

BY

PAṆḌIṬ ḌHANARĀJA

With names and addresses of the persons with whom he said he found them.

Name and address of possessor of Mss.	Name of work—with its extent in shloka-measures of thirty-two syllables each.
(*a*) Paṇḍiṭ Gaurī-Shaṅkara. (Village Ṭārāpur, District Chhaprā).	(1) *Māheshvara Sūṭra* (on Samskṛṭ Grammar)—24,000.
	(2) *Nāraḍīya-Bhāṣhya* on above—62,000.
	(3) *Vaisheṣhika-Sūṭra* in six chapters.
	(4) *Bhāṣhya* on above by Lāṭyāyana.
	(5) Do. by Prashasṭapāḍa (not the one current under the name which is not a commentary on the aphorisms at all, but an independent digest).
	(6) *Vṛṭṭi*, on *Vaisheṣhika-Sūṭra*, by Bhāraḍvāja.

(7) *Vyākaraṇa* by Shiva.

(8) *Shikṣhā* by Do.

(9) *Chhanḍah* by Gaṇesha.

(10) *Jyauṭiṣha* by Sūrya.

(11) *Kalpa* by Shakṭi.

(12) *Nirukṭa* by Sheṣha.

(13) *Granṭha-Chanḍroḍaya* by Gobhila (or Gobhili; a sort of History of Literature).

(14) *Yogopaḍesha* (or *Yogoḍaya)* by Bhārgava.

(*b*) Pt. Hariḍaṭṭa Shāsṭrī. (Butwal Bazār, Kachanāpur, Nepāl Ṭerāi).

(15) Works on *Nyāya*.

(*c*) Pt. Balaḍeva Prasāḍ, son of Pt. Girijā Ḍaṭṭa (Village Barauli, Tahsil Mahārājganj, District Gorakhpur).

(16) The *Eighteen Purāṇas*, interpreted as so many rays of Mahāviṣhṇu.

(17) The *Mahābhāraṭa*, as the siḍḍhānṭa, or final essence and conclusion of all the Eighteen *Purāṇas*, its Eighteen parvas or sections also each corresponding to a ray of Mahāviṣhṇu, the Eighteenth being the quintessence.

(18) *Tīkā* or commentary on the Eighteen Purāṇas, by Gobhili and Gārgyāyaṇa.

(19) Do. by Gobhili on the *Mahābhāraṭa.*

(*d*) Pt. Manohar Daṭṭa Shukla. (Village Kanakpura, District Basṭī.)

(20) Works on *Kāvya* (Poetry).

(21) *Sāṅkhya-Sūṭra* by Kapila—7,000.

(22) *Ratṇanuḍeshinī*, a commentary on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, by Vishvāmiṭṭra.

(*e*) Pt. Chandī Ḍaṭṭa. (Village Siswā, Tahsil and District Basṭī.)

(23) *Mahābhāṣhya* by Patañjalī (Complete—the current one omits many sūṭras.)

(24) *Nīṭyārṇava*—10,000.

(25) *Kriyānuvāḍa*, in 4 parts, by Gālava—24,000.

(*f*) Pt. Yamunā Prasāḍ (Town Bānsi, District Basṭī).

(26) *Ākara-Bhāṣhya* on the *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā.*

(27) *Bhāṣhya* on *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*, by Buḍḍha.

(28) Do., by Gobhili—30,000 (Dictated to Pt. Parmeshri Ḍās).

(29) *Saṅgīṭa-prabhā*—27,000.

(*g*) Pt. Gayā Daṭṭa, son of Pt. Kalāḍhara Prasāḍ. (Mahallā Alinagar, Town Gorakhpur).

(30) *Vṛṭṭi on Nyāya-sūṭra* by Bhāraḍvāja.

(31) *Mahābhāṣhya* (*vide* No. 23 above).

(*h*) Pt. Chanḍra-Shekhara. (Village Ḍoharia, District Gorakhpur.)

(32) The *Veḍas*. (33) *Ainḍrīya Bhāṣhya* on the *Veḍas*.

(34) *Brāhmīya-Bhāṣhya* on Do.

(35) Bārhāyaṇa's *Bhāṣhya* on Do.

(36) *Sāṅkhya-Pravachana-Kārikā*—200,000.

(*i*) Pt. Īshvara Ḍaṭṭa (Do).

(37) Do. (See No. 36 above)

(*j*) The Rājā of Basṭī.

(38) Portions of Do. (No. 36 above.)

(39) Portions of *Bauḍhāyana-Vṛṭṭi* on *Brahma-Sūṭra*. (The current Shrī-bhāṣhya of Rāmānuja on the Brahma-Sūṭra refers to a Vṛṭṭi by Boḍhāyana.)

(*k*) Pt. Gaurī Shaṅkara, (Village Rāmnagrā, District Chaprā).

(40) *Bauḍhāyana-Vṛṭṭi*. (See 39 above).

(41) Bārhāyaṇa's *Bhāṣhya* on *Brahma-Sūṭra*—80,000.

(42) *Gīṭā-Chanḍrikā*, by Vāsuḍeva—3,000.

(43) *Bāṇa-praḍīpa* by Ḍroṇāchārya—25,000.

(44) *Siḍḍhānṭa-Chanḍroḍaya*, a commentary on the *Mahābhāraṭa*, by Vāsuḍeva—4,000,000 (Four millions.)

(*l*) Pt. Jagaḍīsha Sharaṇa. (Village Nauṭanvā Bazār, in Nepal, or District Gorakhpur, twelve or fifteen miles from the boundary of Tahsīl Bānsi, District Basṭī).

(45) Works on *Shilpa*.

(46) *Praṇava-Vāḍa*, by Gargyāyaṇa—16,000 (dictated to Bhagavān Ḍās).

(47) *Yoga-Vāsishtha*—66,000, (the current version has only 32,000 shlokas).

(*m*) Pt. Rāma-Praṭāpa, (Village Sonaurā, P.O. Menḍhāwal, Tahsil Khalilābād, District Basṭī):

(48) *Yoga-ḍarpaṇa*, by Gārgyāyaṇa,—4,000.

(49) *Yoga-raṭnākara*, by Pulasṭya—8,000.

(50) *Shāsṭrānubhava*, by Gobhili—6,000.

(51) *Iṭihāsa-yaugika*, by Shaunaka—8,000.

(52) *Iṭihāsa-samuchchaya*, by Vishvāmiṭṭra—14,000. (A work of this name is quoted by Shrīḍhara in his—published—commentary on the *Vishṇu-Bhāgavaṭa*).

(53) *Viḍhi-raṭnākara*, by Shiva—20,000. (Gives reasons for various kinds of works.)

(54) *Iṭihāsoḍaya*, by Karḍama—16,000.

(55) *Prakṛṭi-khanda*, by Shrī Kṛṣhṇa—12,000. (Hymns.)

(56) *Ḍharma-raṭnākara*—a Dialogue between Kṛṣhṇa and Nāraḍa, about Avaṭāras.—7,000.

(*n*) Pt. Manohar Daṭṭa. (Village Shyāmpur Patnā, Tānsenganj, Nepāl.)

Some works.

(*o*) Lāl Ratna Sena Simha, Rāja of Bānsī, (District Bastī.)

(57) *Varṇa-vāḍa* by Chanḍramaṭī—9,000 (Dictated to the Rājā by Pt. Ḍhanarāja).

(58) *Maheshvara-Bhāṣhya* on *Maheshvara-Vyākaraṇa*—300,000.

Some other works.

(*p*) Pt. Shiva Maṅgala. (Village Ruḍrapur, Tahsil Bānsī, District Basṭī.)

Some works on *Mīmāmsa*.

(q) Pt. Chanḍi Daṭṭa, (Town, Gorakhpur.)

(59) *Praṇavārṇava*—200,000.

(r) Pt. Mannu Ḍeva, son of Pt. Parameshvara Ḍaṭṭa, (Village Harḍoi, Nepal, on the boundary between Nepal and Tahsil Mahārājganj of District Gorakhpur).

(60) *Praṇava-Vāḍa* (See no. 46 above).

(s) Pt. Manojña Daṭṭa Shākaḍvīpī. (Village Jīvā, P. O. and Tahsil Mahārāganj, District Gorakhpur).

(61) *Kāvyāmṛṭa*, by Jamaḍagni —10,000. (on Rhetoric).

(62) *Kāvya Sinḍhu*, by Vāsuḍeva —75,000. (on Rhetoric).

(63) *Kāvya-Ḍarpaṇa*, by Vāsuḍeva—30,000. (a story).

(64) *Kāvya-Ḍarpaṇa*, by Vasuḍeva —5,000 (a story of a Brāhmaṇa).

(t) Pt. Ramānāth. (Village Dōspur, Tahsil Qādīpur, Dt. Sultānpur.

(65) *Bhāva-Siḍḍhanṭa*, by Garga —32,000. (Astronomy).

(66) *Arṭha-Praḍesha*, by Kashyapa. (Ḍharma-shāsṭra).

(*u*) Pt. Shrī Harsha. (Village Rakhnākhor. Tahsil and District Gorakpur).

(67) *Yōga-Vāsiṣhtha*, (See No. 47.)

(*v*) Pt. Girijā Daṭṭa. (Village Barauli, Tahsil Barhal, District Gorakhpur.) (—but see (*c*) above ?)

(68) *Praṇava-Vaḍā*, (See Nos. 46 and 60).

(*w*) Pt. Vaikuntha Nāṭh, son of Pt. Kālī Charan. (Village Kaleshvara, P. O. Sabjanā, Dt. Gorakhpur)

(69) *Pāṭala-Vijaya-Kāvya*, by Pāṇini. (This is quoted in *Subhāshiṭāvalī*, published in the *Bombay Samskṛṭ Series*).

(*x*) Pt. Kuñja Behāri, (Village Belhar Kalān, P. O., Menhdāwal, Tahsil Khalilābād, District Basṭī.).

(70) *Ḍarshanoḍaya* by Gobhili —10,000.

(71) *Brahma-Sūṭra*, 10,000 aphorisms, with *Bārhāyaṇa-Bhāṣhya*—80,000.

(72) *Nyāya-Sūṭra* in six chapters. (Dictated by Pt. Ḍhanarāja to *Bhagavān Ḍās*).

PERSONAL NARRATIVE IN CONNECTION WITH THE *Praṇava-Vāḍa*.

I turn now to the story of the particular work, the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*, of which these volumes purport to be a summary. Into this I will take the liberty of introducing a good deal of personal

matter, for which I crave the indulgence of my readers, my excuse for the procedure being that the personal matter is likely to be of use in appraising the value of the work.

Having been more or less earnestly interested in questions of metaphysic from the year 1881, when I was in my thirteenth year, I had formed for myself, in 1887, while studying for university degrees, a set of philosophical aphorisms in Samskṛt, with an English translation. These embodied answers, to my own satisfaction, to all or most of the final questions of metaphysic, in the shape of definitions of the Ultimates of the World-process. I had them printed for private circulation among friends some time between 1887 and 1890; I am not sure of the exact year now. I reproduce these aphorisms below; and for detailed exposition of the ideas contained in them, and of some slight changes and improvements and corrections introduced into the scheme, I may be permitted to refer to a book, called *The Science of Peace*, written by me, and published by the Theosophical Publishing Society in 1904.

अंथ

वेदान्तहृदयसूत्रम् ।

१. "अहमेतन्नास्मि" इति निष्क्रियमकालमदेशं पूर्णं शाश्वतं परं "ब्रह्म," "परमात्मा" वा ।

२. "एतत्" समष्ट्युपाध्युपहितः "एतन्नास्मि" इति-"ज्ञान" वान् "अहम्" एव पुरुषः, सूत्रात्मा, "ईश्वरः"।

३. "अहमै" क्यविरोधा "देत" "न्नाना" "अणु" रूपमिति।
"एतदे" व "अहमेतदि" ति निर्वचनात् सद्भाववती "एतन्नास्मी" ति निषेधादसद्भावावलम्बिनी सदसती प्रधानाव्यक्तेत्याद्यपरनाम्नी अनन्ताणुरूपा "मूलप्रकृतिः"।

४. अणुरूपै "तद्" व्यष्ट्युपाध्युपहितः "अहमेतद्" इति ज्ञानवान् अहम् "जीवः," "जीवात्मा" वा।

५. अहमा एतदः प्रत्यक्षीकरणमेव "ज्ञानम्"।

६ & ७. तत एव "ज्ञाता" "ज्ञेयं" च।

८. "अह-मेतन्-नास्मी" ति पूर्णज्ञानम् महत्, बुद्धिः, ब्रह्मा, "विद्या" वा।

९. "अहमेतद्" इत्यंशज्ञान "मविद्या"।

१०. "एतन्नास्मी" ति नितान्ताविरोधेऽपि "अहमेतदि" त्यत्यन्तसंरोधात् अहमेतदोः "अन्योऽन्याध्यासः"।

११. "एतदः" अहमपरिमितत्वविरोधेन परिमितत्वम्। परिमिते च "एतदि" "अहमेतदि" ति संयोगस्य "नास्मी" ति च वियोगस्य यौगपद्यासंभवात् "प्रवृत्ति-निवृत्ति," सृष्टिसंहारा, ध्यारोपापवाद, रूप "क्रम" जन्म।

D

१२. क्रम एव "कालः" ।

१३. एकस्मिन् काले नानानाम् संभव एव "देशः," खम्, आकाशः ।

१४. "अहमेतन्नास्मी" तिवाक्यान्तर्गतं क्रम "स्यावश्य-कत्व" मेव "माया" शक्तिर्दैवीप्रकृतिरित्यादि बहु-नामिका भगवती स्तुतिशतसहस्राधिष्ठातृदेवता ॥

The Heart of the Vedānṭa

1. (Aham-eṭaṭ-na) "I-this-not-am" is the Motionless, Timeless, Spaceless, Perfect, Eternal, Supreme Brahman, known otherwise as Paramāṭmā.

2. The "I" sheathed in the totality of the "This" and possessing the knowledge "I am not this" is Purusha, Sūṭrāṭmā, Īshvara.[1]

3. By opposition to the unity of the "I," the "This" is "*many*," hence atomic. This same "This," endowed with being by the affirmation "I (am) This," and deprived of existence by the denial "(I am) This not," hence existent as well as non-existent, is the (ever becoming, ever changing) endlessly atomic Mūlaprakṛṭi—also named Pradhāna, Avyakṭa, etc.

4. The "I" clothed in the sheath of an

[1] This idea has been somewhat modified and developed in *The Science of Peace* where the word used is Praṭyag-āṭmā, a distinction being made between it and Sūṭrāṭmā, for technical purposes. So, more or less slight modifications would have to be made in the wording of the other aphorisms also if they were being written out anew, in the light of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*.

"atom" (*i.e.*, a part of the "This," as distinguished from the totality thereof) and possessing the consciousness, "I (am) this" is the jīva, called otherwise the jīvāṭmā.

5. The placing before itself of the "This" by the "I" is *Knowledge*.

6 & 7. Whence the *Knower* and the *Known*.

8. The full-knowledge "I-this-not-am" is Mahaṭ, Buḍḍhi, Brahmā, Viḍyā.

9. The part-knowledge "I (am) this" is A-viḍyā.

10. The complete identification implied in the "I (am) This," despite the utter opposition conveyed in "(I am) This not," results in (the) *Mutual Assimilation* (of the qualities, so to say, of the "I" and the "This").

11. The "This" by opposition to the unlimitedness of the "I" is "limited". Owing to the impossibility, in the limited This, of a contemporeity of the union (of the I and the This) contained in the "I (am) This" and of the separation involved in the "(I am) This not," results the (succession of the) movement (motion, or cyclic moving) of *Assumption* and *Renunciation*, Creation and Destruction, Hypothesis and Refutation (Manifestation and Absorption, Evolution and Involution, Life and Death, etc., etc.).

12. This succession (of the movement) itself is *Time*.

13. The possibility of the Existence of the "Many" in (and at) one Time is *Space.*

14. The *Necessity* of the movement involved in the sentence "I-this-not-am" is Māyā, Shakṭi, Ḍaivī-Prakṛṭi, the Goddess of a hundred names and a thousand hymns.

When I met Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja, at Bārābaṅkī, in 1897, as said before, and, day after day, heard his astonishing accounts of extant ancient works, I one day asked him whether in any of these he had met with any definition of Brahman, the Absolute, or Paramāṭmā, the Supreme Self, in the words of the first aphorism printed above. He was silent for sometime and then said "Yes". At my further request, he repeated a paragraph in the middle of which occurred, like an islet in a stream, the four words recognisable to me, while on both sides thereof were masses of what was to me then entirely unintelligible language. I asked him whence he had made the quotation. He mentioned the name of *Praṇava-Bhāṣhya* in reply, to the best of my recollection. (When, long after, I referred the point to him, he said my memory was at fault, and that he had mentioned the right name, *Praṇava-Vāḍa*, from the very beginning.)

My opportunities, at the time, of seeing and conversing with him, were not many or long, because of the exigencies of the service I was in.

I was, moreover, shortly transferred by the Government to another district, and so lost sight of him for the time being. I resigned the service in March, 1899, partly to find more time for such studies as I was interested in, and partly to look after the secretarial work of the Central Hinḍū College, Benares, founded a few months previously by Mrs. Annie Besant, in the best and highest interests of Hinḍū youth and Hinḍū religion. In the winter of 1899-1900 I wrote out *The Science of the Emotions*, the main ideas of which I had put forward many years previously in a very roughly sketched article, entiled "Findings," in *The Theosophist*, in 1894; and the work was published in London, by the Theosophical Publishing Society, in the summer of 1900.

About the end of July in this latter year I went to Bārābaṅkī for a couple of days to pay a visit to my old friend Paṇḍiṭ Parmeshrī Ḍās. At the latter's house I saw Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja again. The broken conversations of 1897 were resumed. I made further enquiries about the commentary on the *Praṇava* the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* as he called it now. He repeated passages from it; also from what he declared was an ancient commentary by Bārhāyaṇa on the original *Brahma-Sūṭras.* My interest was aroused strongly. Between this interest on the one hand, and the doubts and suspicions hanging around the

man on the other, it appeared to me that a serious experiment should be made, and a full and fair opportunity given to the Paṇḍiṭ to help the public, if he really could, with an ancient work which, from the promise of the oral extracts, would be of immense value.

I invited Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja to come and stay with me at Benares, where the home of my family is. He agreed. I returned to Benares, made necessary arrangements, and sent men to fetch him from Bārābaṅkī. He arrived in Benares on the morning of the 30th August, 1900. On the next day I began writing down the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* to his dictation. We worked for about four hours each morning. I took down about 125 shloka-measures (equal to 4,000 Samskṛṭ letters or syllables) in about two hours, carefully re-read to him the previous day's writing, and made the necessary correct-ions that he pointed out in another hour, and spent the fourth hour in little breaks for rest, and in general talk and discussion of any words or sentences in the work that offered any difficulty to me. In this way I finished about 4,000 shloka-measures in the month of September.

As the writing proceeded my understanding of the archaic Samskṛṭ improved, and my interest in the work, and wonderment at the coincidences of its thought with the views I had arrived at independently before, grew apace.

But at the end of September, 1900, other urgent business, mainly connected with the Central Hinḍū College, and partly with the Theosophical Society, the Indian Section of which has its headquarters at Benares, unavoidably took up all my time and attention. I began to feel very anxious as to how a break could be avoided in the work of writing down the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*. Just then, most fortunately and providentially, my old friend and junior at College, Gaṅgānāṭh Jhā, M.A. (author of many valuable translations of Saṁskṛṭ works, then Librarian to the Mahārāja of Ḍarbhaṅgā), turned up on a six weeks' leave to stay with us in Benares, amidst old associations. I seized the opportunity, worked up his interest in the matter without any difficulty, and induced him to take my seat at the writing-table.

I used to pique myself on my power of writing the Samskṛṭ, *i.e.*, the Ḍevanāgarī character, fast. I used to write, on an average, one shloka-measure or thirty-two syllables per minute to Paṇdiṭ Ḍhanarāja's dictation, the arrangement between him and me being that he should speak out half that measure once, and wait for an audible sign from me to proceed with another half shloka-measure, without repeating any words except when I happened to become doubtful and made a special request for a repetition. But Gaṅgānāṭh Jhā fairly surpassed me, and in

the six weeks he stayed with us, he took down to the dictation of the blind man nearly 8,000 shloka-measures. Then he had to go back and rejoin his post.

I began again about the middle of November, 1900, and, by the end of the month, reduced to writing another 2,000 shlokas. In the beginning of December, 1900, I had to go out with Mrs. Besant on a tour in the North of India, in connexion with the College and the Theosophical Society. I, therefore, engaged Paṇḍiṭ Ambā Ḍās Shāsṭrī, a Paṇḍiṭ of Benares, educated in Samskṛṭ in the indigenous way, with a special training in the *Nyāya* Philosophy, to complete the work for me. I may note here that Paṇḍiṭ Ambā Ḍās does not know English. He completed the last 2,000 shlokas of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* on the 9th January, 1901.

Throughout the months of October, November and December, 1900, and up to the 13th of January, 1901, I used to avail myself of the spare hours that I could secure during the days I was in Benares, generally between the hours of 9 and 11 in the night, to read out to the blind Paṇḍiṭ what had been written by Gangānāṭh Jhā or Ambā Ḍās Shāsṭrī, and correct any mistakes that had crept in, as pointed out by him. This work of revision was also completed on the 13th January, 1901.

Between the 13th and the 19th January, 1901,

I took down to the Paṇḍiṭ's dictation the original "Preface" to the book, which for some reason of his own, never explained to me, he had reserved to the last. On the 19th January, 1901, Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja left for his home in Belhar Kalān.

Although, on repeated reading, the language of the work becomes, generally speaking, intelligible, yet the precise sense remains often obscure and indefinable. It will remain obscure throughout to minds not specially trained and prepared by previous metaphysical study to grasp and utilise slight clues to subtle ideas. There are other drawbacks to a study of the work: too much repetition of the same ideas in only slightly different forms or aspects and only slightly different language; too much condensation in one place, and over-prolixity in another; and so on. Yet, despite these drawbacks, as they are from a modern point of view, the work is unique. It is different entirely from anything on the subject of Philosophy now current in Samskṛṭ, or any other language, so far as I am aware. It has had a special charm and attraction for me, and has aroused an almost superstitious enthusiasm in me, because of the entire agreement of its line of thought with that which I evoked for myself independently many years before I knew anything about Pandiṭ Ḍhanarāja, or about this

work, and an aphoristic outline of which I had circulated privately in print amongst a few friends, and then sketched out roughly in a few articles under the titles of "To Him That Seeks," "Findings," and "Further Findings," in *The Theosophist* for March, May and October, 1894, and later on published in fuller detail in *The Science of the Emotions* and *The Science of Peace*, in 1900 and 1904 respectively.

I have already stated how *The Science of the Emotions* was written out in the winter of 1899-1900, when I possessed only an acquaintance with Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja, and had not yet heard anything from him about the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* beyond the mere name. I found, later on, the main ideas of that book expounded in the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* in a few pages of the third and largest section, on *Kriyā*, entitled the *Kriyā-Prakaraṇa*.

I may be permitted to add here, with respect to *The Science of Peace*, that it is practically a detailed commentary on the set of aphorisms reproduced above, made by me for my own use in 1887, as said before; and deals with most of the many questions incidentally raised in *The Science of the Emotions*, and left there to be answered elsewhere, as belonging to metaphysic. The drafting of this work, *The Science of Peace*, was begun in June 1900, when I was away, for a change of air, at the

hill town of Waltair, also called Vizagapatam, on the sea-shore, midway between Calcutta and Madras on the eastern coast of India. The whole of it, and the bulk of a continuation of it, dealing especially with metaphysical psychology of cognition, desire and action (not yet published) was drafted out in June, and on my return to Benares, in July 1900, just before the beginning of the reduction into writing of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*. More of the continuation was drafted, in a sporadic manner, during the time the other was being taken down. (This is yet in hand and may be revised and published later.)

The correspondences, nay, frequently, identities of thought between my draft and the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* were very startling to me; and have been the main cause for my, so to say, superstitious faith in the latter work. It came upon me more and more strongly, as I proceeded with the work, that on the one hand I was taking down, in one form and language, to dictation from the rote-memory of another, what I had been reproducing on the other hand, in another form and language, and much more imperfectly, from my own reason-memory of the samskāra, the impress, of past births; and that both forms were derived, not only from the Common Store of All-knowledge, All-consciousness, which is in and which is the World-process at large, and

whence and wherein is all knowledge whatsoever, but also, more particularly, from a special literature which existed and was extant and matter of public knowledge and study in India, some thousands of years ago, and which still exists, but now inextant and hidden, and to be rediscovered by single-minded and laborious search only.

After having taken down to dictation the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*, I felt for some time that it was perhaps not necessary for me to continue work on *The Science of Peace*. But on looking at the two again, I saw that while the root-principles, the main ideas, were the same, there was much difference in the method of treatment and the details. My draft, I saw, taking its stand on the one, single, indispensable, and indefeasible fact of consciousness, endeavoured to lead thought up from current answers to the ultimate problem of metaphysic, regarding them as insufficient, to a higher and (as it appeared to me) more perfect synthesis and complete explanation, and then to deduce all other root-ideas and principles therefrom; and so dealt almost entirely with the *why* of things. The older work, on the other hand, practically started where my draft ended, assumed the root-ideas as proved, as, in fact, matter of common knowledge, and at once entered upon numerous applications of those root-ideas to the facts around us, to the details

of the World-process, of human life and evolution, and to the technicalities of Samskṛṭ literature in particular, which had never entered into my mind. In other words, the difference between the two works was the difference between abstract and concrete, laws and cases, rules and facts. Moreover, the older work was full of obscurities, and full of technical ways of thought and expression, unfamiliar to readers of English and thinkers employing the modern counters of thought; while the newer work was written more, though not by any means entirely, from the standpoint and in the language of modern philosophical thought. It seemed to me, indeed, that the newer work would serve efficiently as an introduction and help to the study of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*, showing, as it did, the steps by which the principles and conclusions taught in an ancient and now hidden literature had been worked up to anew by an individual consciousness, in modern days, and without any help from that previous literature. I therefore decided to put *The Science of Peace*, before the public. I shall endeavour and hope I may be able to place the continuation of the work before them also, later on, for similar reasons.

In concluding this note I would record my deep gratitude to Mrs. Annie Besant, who was the first to appreciate *The Science of the*

Emotions and *The Science of Peace*, and who read them in manuscript, suggested many improvements, encouraged me to publish the works, and finally had them published by the Theosophical Publishing Society, giving a series of lectures on each book, while it was in the Press, and thereby introducing the main ideas to a much larger public than they would have reached otherwise, and in a far more lucid and interesting manner than the written treatises have achieved; and who, again, has encouraged and enabled me to publish the present work, and not only done so but has embellished it with valuable footnotes from her own pen.

I have written down the above personal history in the hope that I may thereby inspire a special interest in the work, by pointing out such an extraordinary coincidence connected therewith, as is, even by itself, and apart from the inherent merits of the work, no mean test of truth. Unless there is an agreement of basic fact, such coincidences do not occur. When they do occur they constitute at least sufficient reason for careful enquiry. I myself earnestly believe that there is a providential purpose in this coincidence, and that the time has come when the general modern public, prepared by the ideas of the great German philosophers, by the world-wide revival of interest in Samskṛṭ learning and philosophy, especially *Veḍānṭa*, and finally by

the Theosophical movement and literature—than which there is no more promising seed, at the present day, of all-embracing tolerance and sympathy and brotherhood—is ready for a larger metaphysic, a deeper psychology, a more reason-supported ethic than it has been content with so long, a metaphysic and a science of Yoga that will form the completing keystone of the great dome of knowledge, wherein the different sciences serve as the building stones, bound together by the mortar of psychology and physiology.

With this foreword, I would leave the reader to judge whether the work satisfies or does not satisfy lastingly any deep-seated need of his. But before proceeding to the actual summary of the work I should say, in two more preliminary notes, something about the genuineness of the work, and about the nature of this summary.

———

III.

The Genuineness of the Work.

A question that would naturally strike anyone, not wholly one-pointed towards the inherent merits or demerits of the book, but also interested in side-questions as to its authorship, with regard to a work purporting to have been taken down to dictation from alleged memory under such extraordinary conditions as those described above, would be : " Is the work genuine ? Is the man telling the truth when he says he learnt it off by rote in such and such circumstances ? Or is it only another of those forgeries with which the history of literature is studded ? "

The easiest and most satisfactory proof of its genuineness would, clearly, have been an old and independent manuscript. Such a manuscript Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja has not been able to supply; and for this inability he advances reasons which, from his standpoint, and in view of the conditions under which he obtained access to the work, are not wholly unintelligible or invalid. He, a blind man, could never himself make use of a manuscript and never tried to acquire one, and the Paṇḍiṭ or Paṇḍiṭs who had copies would not part with them.

The independent search, made by some of my friends, as mentioned before, in the places

mentioned by Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja, has so far proved unsuccessful.

All this, however, is quite in keeping with the habit, well known to be strongly prevalent in India, of concealing old and rare manuscripts; and the absence of this first and highest degree of proof does not therefore necessarily stamp the dictated *Praṇava-Vāḍa* as a forgery.

The proof that would have been satisfactory in the next degree could have been supplied by a good test of memory. If I know a thing by heart I can repeat it not once only but a hundred times. If, then, Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja could repeat a second time what he had dictated once, it would at least be clear that the matter was mnemonic. For the instance is not easily found of a man talented enough to dictate four to six thousand syllables of his own extempore composition, at a single sitting, without a single break, and as fast as a fast writer could take them down, and also to go on impressing those syllables so fully on his memory as to be able to reproduce them exactly at will later on. If Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja *were* such an exception, then also he would be a prodigy, a genius, the like of whom the world has not often seen before; perhaps though even otherwise, on any other theory whatever, his performances are wonderful enough!

But Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja during all the years

that he was known to Paṇḍiṭ Parmeshrī Ḍās, and has been known to me, has never repeated a second time what he dictated and got reduced to writing once. He has never flatly declined to do so either; but he has always evaded any request of this kind. "I am not feeling well enough, just now. I am tired. I shall do so some other time, when I am better," etc. When requested to declare definitely and frankly whether he never would, or whether he had taken any vow not to so repeat what he had dictated, he has always said: "I will satisfy you and do what you wish some other time," etc. That other time has yet to come.

In other matters also, as for instance the producing of manuscripts which he admitted were in his family house and in his possession, or otherwise under his control, he has often made contradictory statements which have given rise to a presumption of some peculiarity in his nature, such as neuropaths and intellectual *lusus naturæ* often suffer from, especially when they are also labouring under the sad privation of sight.

Taking these facts together, with (1) the obscure, abstruse, and even sometimes uncouth nature of many portions of what has been taken down from him, and with (2) the facts that the Samskṛṭ which flows so uninterruptedly from his lips is frequently ungrammatical, as judged

by the standards of Pāṇini, and that the sentences are often incomplete and wanting in *prima facie* connexion with each other, the result has been that many impatient friends who came to "bless" have gone away "cursing". They have hastily decided that the man was a "humbug" pure and simple, that his utterances were the merest gabble, that whatever portions of them happened to be intelligible were nothing else than pickings from the brains of his friends made during conversation on theosophical and philosophical subjects, and that all his talk about a vast old world of literature buried away in the homes of private families was mere mystification, and even downright deception.

Are these friends right? It is impossible to convince them that they are not, if they are not willing to take into account any other than the two tests mentioned. But a third test remains to be applied; and really it is the only important and satisfactory one to apply in such cases. None of these friends spent more than two or three hours altogether in trying and deciding the case of Ḍhanarāja; some perhaps only as many minutes. What have *they* got to say who have had the patience to spend hundreds, even thousands, of hours in weighing *internal evidence*, the intrinsic merits of the dictated material?

Perhaps I shall not be judged guilty of an improper presumption if I say that I can speak with a certain amount of confidence about the *Praṇava-Vāḍa.* In reducing it to writing, in reading it back to Paṇdiṭ Ḍhana-rāja, in reading it over and over again, in writing out marginal notes, in summarising, paraphrasing and translating it into English, and finally taking this summary through the press, I have spent many thousands of hours distributed over a period of nearly ten years, beginning with the 31st of August 1900 and ending with the publication of these volumes. And at the end of all this labour my firm conviction is that it is a work which—with all its shortcomings of obscurity of sense and language, of redundances and verbosities, on the one hand, and excessive compressions on the other, and of a mannerism that is apt to tire a modern reader—is unrivalled in the whole mass of *extant* Samskṛṭ literature, and, so far as I am aware through the medium of the English language, in any other philosophical literature also, for profound and all-comprehending metaphysic, for penetrating insight into and luminous solution of the deepest and darkest problems of all life, for incessant proof into and of the breakless interconnexion of all the infinite details of the World-process, for holding up the highest ideals of the fortunes and functions of human evolution, and

finally for a suggestiveness that opens up endless vistas of possible knowledge before the straining eyes of the thinking reader. The only other work *extant* which has the same characteristics of comprehensive helpfulness is *The Secret Doctrine* of H. P. Blavatsky. And that and this supplement each other and make one whole, as metaphysic and science, as abstract and concrete, as principles and details. But the history of the writing of that work, and of its sister-work, *Isis Unveiled*, is even more 'mysterious' and 'suspicious' from the standpoint of the reader who is wholly out of touch with the psychic phenomena of the realm of the superphysical, than this. (See Col. H. S. Olcott's *Old Diary Leaves*, Vols. i. and iii., and *The Secret Doctrine* itself, Vol. i., *Introductory* pp. xxiii, xxiv, *et seq.*)

It is, further, my conviction, also based on the nature of the book, that it is not a work which can have been produced independently of any connected and co-existing literature and science, like Minerva springing full-armed from the forehead of Jupiter, but is necessarily in organic articulation with a whole large mass of literature of a similar nature, and is itself only the essential and all-important typus of a vast-ranging kind of thought which is radically different in its ensouling principle from much of the things now extant. The following quotation has a special value in this reference:

". . . MSS., hitherto buried out of. . . reach. . . would again come to light, and with them the key to much of that which was hidden for ages from the popular understanding. . ." (Letter of the Master K. H., quoted in A. P. Sinnett's *The Occult World*, p. 115.)

My enthusiasm over the work is probably and naturally excessive, because of the amount of time I have spent over it, and of the personal reasons mentioned before. But after discounting all such excess, I believe that there will still be left behind for every reader a tangible residuum of justifiable appreciation. As an English friend who started with a bias against rather than for the work, remarked to me, after looking through a considerable portion of the translation in manuscript: "There is stuff in it; it should be published."

Of such merit (or otherwise) in the work, the reader can and will, of course, form his own opinion, and which is said above is only by way of general recommendation to him to read what, I earnestly believe, will be helpful to him.

But one thing remains to be mentioned in this connexion, of which the reader would ordinarily not have an opportunity of judging, and which I therefore add here as matter of personal experience. It is this: Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja, from what I have seen of him, has no more the power of creating this work out of his own

intelligence than he has of creating the solar system. He lived with me for five months. I sat in his company for many hours almost every day of these months, with one break of three weeks. And I know that he does not understand some portions of the book, which are not unintelligible to the student of theosophy.

I have often discussed the sense of passages with him, and he has often admitted that his previous explanation was wrong and mine right, after consulting (as he said) in his own memory, of course, what he called Gobhili's commentary on the *Praṇava-Vāḍa,* two or three fragments from which commentary also I have taken down from him, just for curiosity. Again I have tried to converse with him, in ordinary modern Samskṛṭ, on every day matters, and he has found it difficult, or at least given me the impression, by his halting and laboured efforts, that he found it difficult, to construct half a dozen sentences in either modern Samskṛṭ or that of the works he dictates. He has always given me the impression that while he was no doubt a more than commonly intelligent man, his intelligence was of the kind to give him a general understanding of the meaning and value of what he was dictating; not of the kind to enable him to discover and put forth the ideas and words newly himself, or even, always, to make that significance explict

to others, who could often see more in his words than he himself could do.

Also, as collateral facts in support of the view that the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* existed in Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja's memory as a completed whole, before he began dictating it to me, may be mentioned these :—Before beginning the work, I asked him what its extent was in shloka-measures, in order to calculate the total amount of time needed, and to regulate my daily routine accordingly. He unhesitatingly mentioned 16,000 shloka-measures, and my manuscript, on completion, bore out the truth of the statement. This manuscript consists of 535 pages of ruled foolscap, each page containing thirty-four lines of writing, and each line from twenty-five to thirty-two letters, or on an average twenty-eight letters, thirty-two letters making one shloka-measure. Again, from time to time, as we completed one section or chapter or part, he stated the progressive total of shloka-measures reached, and also stated beforehand the shloka-measures in the next section or chapter. All these statements have been justified by the manuscript. Moreover, when I was reading over to him the previous day's work, he frequently made small corrections, and more than once asked me, incidentally, to refer back to such and such a place, in order to verify the consistency of the correction with a previous statement in the text,

and he directed me to that previous statement by saying how far back, in approximate shloka-measures, I should refer. Also, the Author's Preface, dictated to me *after* the text of the work was completed, contains a fair and orderly table of the contents of the whole, and supplies indirectly the memory-test discussed before.

The theory that he picks the material for his 'pretended' old works out of the brains of those with whom he conversed will not stand examination. In the first place, even if he had the ability to pick others' brains of ideas, which in itself is no mean power, he had not, as said before, sufficient Samskṛṭ to clothe them. Secondly, to confine ourselves to the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*, the book contains far more than I had ever dreamt of; while the root-ideas are the same as already existed in my mind, these ideas have been applied, in the book, to fields of knowledge to which I was quite unable to apply them. There is a large mass of details there which was never in my waking consciousness at least. Theories as to their having been present in my sub- or supra-consciousness, and Ḍhanarāja having absorbed them by telepathy, or of their being dictated by a "familiar" spirit—are all less in accordance with the well-recognised law of scientific and philosophic investigation and postulation of hypotheses, *viz.*, the Law of Parsimony, which requires that the simplest

possible hypothesis should be adopted, than the supposition that the Paṇḍiṭ was repeating parrot-like what he had learnt by rote. It should be stated here, that Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja himself, when such suggestions were made to him in the way of enquiry, emphatically repudiated all such explanations, and insisted that it was pure memory. When pressed to say if he felt nothing abnormal and peculiar when dictating these works, he said whenever he was making these great efforts of memory he felt something like a thread or nerve working up and down between his eyes within the forehead. This *might* mean the stimulation of the physical memory by the working of some subtler sense of sight or rather of hearing, for by his account, he never himself *saw* and *read* the books, being blind, but only *heard* them read out, and impressed them on his memory only through the sense of hearing.

The possibility that the Paṇḍiṭ has reproduced and dictated matter which he has studied and digested and thought out and systematised for himself independently, in the same way that great orators and practising lawyers and scientific and philosophical lecturers and preachers have in ancient and modern times orally delivered large works which are studied with profit by generations—this possibility may be considered from another standpoint.

I have already said that my own experience

of the Paṇḍiṭ's intelligence and ability is that they are not enough to account for the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* The other standpoint from which the question may be considered, assuming my judgment of his abilities to be wrong, is that of the question: What motive had the Paṇḍiṭ to tell the lie that the work is not his own, when it is? Of course this enquiry can proceed only on the assumption that the work has some merit and is not mere gabble; otherwise, it is obvious, the query is superfluous, and the whole discussion falls to the ground.

The question then is, why should not the Paṇḍiṭ claim the rightful credit of the authorship of such a remarkable work? If he did so, he would win a certain amount of fame and honour or, if he was above such considerations, would be doing the plain duty of telling the truth. He seemed to have nothing to gain by persisting in a false repudiation of authorship. I can find no satisfactory answer to this question. The only answer that can be possibly advanced on the data we have, is the unsatisfactory one that he is eccentric. Of course a certain amount of eccentricity has to be assigned to him on the other hypothesis also, *viz.*, that he has really committed a genuine old work to memory from a manuscript which was read out to him, and has now dictated it, but will not repeat what he has dictated once.

But between the two eccentricities, the latter seems to have some method in it. It is possible that he declines to undergo tests of memory either for fear of making mistakes which might be made too much of, or for some other reasons, such as promises made to those with whom he studied, which he does not wish to be known publicly. The other eccentricity, of falsely repudiating authorship, does not show even such traces of method.

A statement here as to the *Gobhili-Bhāṣhya* on the *Bhagavaḍ Gīṭā*, about 26,000 shloka-measures in extent, all dictated by the blind man to Paṇḍiṭ Parmeshrī Ḍās, would also be helpful as evidence in enabling the reader to form his own conclusions as to the genuineness of Ḍhanarāja's performances. I myself have not had time enough to read through the whole of this systematically. Paṇḍiṭ Gaṅgānāṭh Jhā has, however, been kind enough, at my request, to do so, and he has also made an abstract in English of its interpretation of the *Gīṭā*. He says that the work has a perfectly rational consistency and a distinct style and manner of its own, and refers to very many other old works now unknown even by name; but, he adds, the work has nothing remarkably new or extraordinary, or not now generally known, to tell us; and is therefore disappointing in respect of any expectations of esoteric interpretation and occult

knowledge. The portions that I have myself succeeded in studying, of this book confirm Paṇḍiṭ Gaṅgānāṭh's view. I should add, however, that there is a good deal in it which is very suggestive of new ideas, and stimulates thought to work along unusual directions in a reader with the necessary turn of mind. The characters of the *Mahābhāraṭa* story, Yuḍhishṭhira, Arjuna, Ḍuryoḍhana, etc., are also explained in the first chapter as allegorical symbols of various conditions and moods of the mind; and this is distinctly new, or at least not extant. The set manner of commenting is to take each word and postulate in succession a number of meanings, on the strength of the explanations of the word given in various *Koshas* (dictionaries), and to refute each hypothesis by reasons, till the last and correct meaning is left behind, and this is generally in accordance with the (old) *Nirukṭa*. Briefly, the method followed is the approved method of *Veḍānṭa*, a ḍ h y ā r o p a, *i.e.*, superimposition, assumption by hypothesis, and then a p a v ā ḍ a, *i.e.*, refutation.

Considering all these facts together, the proper conclusion to draw seems to me to be that while Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja may have indulged in exaggerations, mystifications, sensationalism, sometimes even divergences from truth, and self-contradictions, there is behind and beneath all these a certain amount of basic truth which

makes it eminently desirable that persons with better opportunities and abilities than I have had at my disposal, should systematically take up the work of investigation and search for old MSS. on the spot.

To reiterate, with respect to the *Praṇava-Vāḍa,* over and above all other considerations must always stand the consideration of the inherent merits of the work itself. It has always been the test of truth that it should be independent of the virtues and vices, perfections and failings of any one individual, that it should not be claimable as the exclusive property or invention of any one person, and that even in connexion with the mere *discovery* of any truth the personality should remain or become doubtful, so that the truth may stand on its own feet and not on those of any passing mortal. The best work generally is, or rapidly becomes, nameless. Truth is the property of every one. Why should any one be allowed to claim it exclusively? Those ideas only are really true to every one which come home to every one, which every one feels he has himself discovered or always possessed. Even such works as the great epics and dramas of the nations, different as they are in nature from scientific or metaphysical truths, become nameless—because they embody that surpassing excellence of description which makes them truths of psychology and ethics. What do we

know of Vālmīki or Vyāsa or Homer? Even Shakespeare is becoming shadowy. Well may the *Praṇava-Vāḍa,* then, rest on its own merits and well may its authorship remain always doubtful! Facts, laws, theories, should be judged in themselves, independently of who propounds them. The way in which *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine* have been given to the world has been already referred to. The Paurāṇic story tells how Inḍra came to Uṭaṅka disguised as a foul chāndāla, and offered him the nectar of immortality in that guise. Uṭaṅka refused to take it and lost his chance, for the time being. Truth often comes to its votary in uncouth garb, just to test whether the votary loves it or only the garb; to test whether he has developed the keenness and strength of eyesight which can discern it unerringly beneath all changes of outer form—*when* only he can really profit by it; or whether he is yet too feeble of mental vision and grasp to be able to successfully perceive and hold it. "One of the most valuable effects of Upāsikā's (H. P. Blavatsky's) mission is that it drives men to self-study and destroys in them blind servility to persons." (Letter from a Master quoted in Col. Olcott's *Old Diary Leaves* Vol. iii. p. 92.) So let us judge the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* by its own merits, whatever the quality or the name of the writer may be.

Before concluding this section of the introduc-

tion I wish to state that I have appeared to myself as rather wanting in appreciation and gratitude, while writing as I have written about the blind Paṇḍiṭ. But I have done so and pointed out his shortcomings myself only in order that others, less sympathetic, less appreciative, less bound by gratitude, may not do it in a worse form, with exaggeration and without balance. I have acted on the instinct which makes a brother feel that for any sin he may have committed, he would rather be punished by his own brother, who, even in inflicting the stroke, would feel sad, would feel that he was cleansing and purifying for rehabilitation, than by the public gaoler, who would have no such sympathy and yearnings.

My gratitude to him is deep indeed for the confirmation and amplification he has brought to me of my most cherished views, for the hopes he has given me of further discovery, for having accepted me as the repository of one of his most precious possessions, without any obvious and sufficient reason and remuneration of any kind. Holding the views I hold about him, his shortcomings arouse in me only the affectionate sympathy due to the neuropath, the genius encased in a frail body, the sensitive and shrinking soul bound to a sightless frame, that has not met in the early years of life the friendliness that aroused

confidence and trust, but the want of sympathy that leaves behind a permanent apprehension of pain from others.

I earnestly hope that no reader of mine will make this mistake, of imagining me to be wanting in gratitude to the Paṇḍiṭ, who compares these few pages of a criticism that is only intended to disarm worse criticism, that is only intended to uphold justice as against blind partiality on the one hand and equally blind condemnation on the other, with the many pages of the summary of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* that are the most expressive embodiment of my appreciation of him.

F

IV.

The Nature of the Praṇava-Vāḍa.

A tradition, common all over India, is that the world is derived from *Veḍa* (which etymologically means Knowledge and which contains all knowledge whatsoever), that the essence and source of the *Veḍa* is the *Gāyaṭrī* with certain *Mahā Vākyas*, and that these, finally, are born from the *Aum*. Consequently the *Praṇava* (which is the name of the sound Aum, pronounced as Ōm) is the most sacred of sounds. Such is the tradition. But what the reason for it is, is not quite clear. The *Māṇdūkya*, the *Ṭāra-Sāra*, and other *Upanishaṭs*, the *Gopaṭha Brāhmaṇa*, and *Ṭanṭra*-works give many elaborate and instructive interpretations of the three letters A, U and M, of which this sound is made up; but none seems sufficient to justify such an all-comprehensive claim as is made by the tradition.

The *Praṇava-Vāḍa* justifies it. It explains that A stands for the Self, U for the Not-Self and M, for the relation of negation which exists between them. It is obvious that these three factors, or rather two factors and the nexus between them, exhaust the All without leaving behind any remainder.

The AUM, thus, is equivalent to the Idea or Consciousness "I-This-Not (am)". The three factors of this single, partless, timeless, spaceless and motionless consciousness, in the simultaneous affirmation and negation involved in their juxtaposition, constitute the triune Brahman, the Absolute, which is at once the Changeless as well as the exhaustless storehouse of all change and of all that changes.

All the main facts of the World-process are deduced from this logion, which is shown as the one law of all laws, all other laws being corollaries from it.

The permutations and combinations of the three factors give rise to various subordinate *Mahā-vākyas,* great sentences, logia, each of which represents one principal law or method governing the World-process. Four, the most important, form the foundations of the four *Veḍas* respectively—the *Aṭharva* dealing with the logion, "I-This-Not", itself, and summing up the other three *Veḍas* and their logia. Twenty-four other logia, next in importance, are each represented by one letter of the *Gāyaṭrī.* The *Veḍas* may be regarded as an extended interpretation of the significance of the *Gāyaṭrī.*

The interplay between the A and the U, the Self and the Not-Self, by affirmation and then negation, gives rise to the Jīva, or individual Ego, and to various triplets of qualities or

attributes in Spirit and Matter. The most important are Cognition, Desire and Action in the former, and Substantiality, Sensuous Quality, and Mobility in the latter. The Samskṛṭ equivalents are j ñ ā n a, i c h c h h ā and k r i y ā, and ḍ r a v y a, g u ṇ a and k a r m a respectively.

The *Ṛg-Veḍa* deals with j ñ ā n a, Cognition, Knowledge, predominantly. The *Yajuh* with k r i y ā, action. The *Sāma* with i c h c h h ā, desire. The *Aṭharva* with the summation of them all. Each of these is reflected and re-reflected endlessly in the others, giving occasion for the statement, in the work, of much valuable and exceedingly interesting and suggestive information on the psychology of cognition, desire, and action.

The outlines of the whole of the World-process, and consequently the whole circle of human knowledge, are laid down in terms of Veḍic technicalities, under the headings of : (1) the *Weḍas*, with their fourfold sub-division into (*a*) *Samhiṭā* or *Manṭra*, (*b*) *Brāhmaṇa*, (*c*) *Upanishaṭ*, and (*d*) *Upaveḍa*, or *Tanṭra*, and their developments into the (*e*) *Kṛshṇa* and *Shukla Shākhās*, or *Yanṭra*, the Black and White branches, of *each Veḍa*; (2) the six *Aṅgas*; and (3) the six *Upāṅgas*. Each of these is divided and sub-divided endlessly; and many derivative and intermediate sciences are mentioned.

Metaphysical explanations of the sacraments are given.

Cycles of time and space with their respective Rulers or Īshvaras are touched upon. The nature of m u k ṭ i is discussed in terms of the logion. The various *Aṅgas* and *Upāṅgas,* sciences and philosophies, are shown to be consistent parts of one organic whole. Spiritual and material evolution, through mineral, vegetable, animal, human, and various other kingdoms, astral or elemental, and the development of sixth and seventh senses in future cycles, are referred to. And the high destiny and the ultimate development of j ī v a s into Ī s h v a r a s and creators of ever new world-systems, and the real as well as technical significance of m o k ṣ h a, are described with great fulness.

It should be emphatically noted in conclusion, that whatever else the matter of the book may be, it is entirely and absolutely unique. There is nothing like it to be found in extant Samskṛṭ works.

One question will inevitably strike the modern reader at this point. Is there any connexion, any reconciliation possible, between this profound interpretation of the *Veḍas,* which goes to justify the exaggerated, nay, extravagant-seeming reverence traditionally paid to them in India, on the one hand, and, on the other, that recent interpretation of them which looks upon

them as "the babblings of child-humanity," the improvisations of rival bards of warring and semi-savage tribes, the incantations of fetish-worshippers, a medley of the natural beauty and poetry of primeval man, and the artificial customs and superstitions born of animal terrors and malice, and worship and propitiation of anthropomorphised sun and moon and fire and wind and rain?

This is a difficult question to answer. It is not possible to pooh-pooh the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* after carefully reading it; it is not possible to ignore all the results of modern scholarship and research; and yet the one pictures saints and sages, and the other ill-trained, even savage, children! But perhaps we have the explanation and reconciliation in these very words. The grandfather and the child riding on his knee form parts of the same congruous picture, and not of two incongruous ones. The objection to which the modern theory is open, *viz.*, the assumption involved in it that children are able not only to appreciate highly poetical and allegorical tales, but to write them, is also obviated by this explanation. The grandfather Brahmā, the Piṭāmaha, *par excellence*, the Manus and Ṛṣhis, the Hierarchs, Guides and Guardians of the Human Race, explain to their first children the facts and laws of Nature, in language which because of their comprehensive thought is corres-

pondingly comprehensive of all possible good and evil aspects of the World-process; the children understand only the story-aspect of them, and very often misunderstand and misapply them too. When the modern scientist says that plants compete with each other for food, that they marry, that they beget children, and that they make the best provision in their power for their children, he is talking poetical myths as well as rigorous science; if his hearers misunderstand him it is little fault of his. This is only one consideration which seems the most generally applicable. For detailed discussions and facts and other considerations bearing on the subject, the student who has not already finally made up his mind that the scriptures of nations are babble, should study theosophical literature generally. The *Praṇava-Vāḍa* will of course be of much help to him, although it does not deal with interpretations of *Veḍa*-texts directly.

V.

The Manner of the Book.

The matter of the book has been indicated, in the briefest possible hints, above. Its manner is, generally speaking, to make a statement on each sub-head in more intelligible and modern-like prose, and then subjoin a sort of mnemonic summary in less intelligible and archaic verse, which seems (and is said by Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja) to be quoted from older works. The verses dealing with the detail of each department of the World-process are mostly in the Anuṣhtup-metre; those which, by antithesis, describe the nature of the Absolute 'as transcending these details' are in another longer and more musical metre. These verses illustrate the poetry of rigorous and powerful metaphysic, as distinguished from the less rigorous and, therefore, softer and sweeter metaphysic of the Sūfī poets of Persia. So far as I am aware, there are not many instances of it in western literature. Some sonnets by Fichte, some pieces by the medieval mystics, and Lucretius' poem on Nature would be such. It is difficult to understand what a hymn to the Absolute can be. These verses help us to understand.

In connexion with these archaic verses, it may be interesting to note that Paṇḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja

once made a statement to the effect that there were many 'layers' in Samskṛṭ literature, of which the *Veḍas,* and their coeval works in expansion or exposition of them, including the first works on *Aṅga* and *Upāṅga,* constituted the first layer. He also stated that all this first layer was the work of gods of various degrees, Avaṭāras, descended upon earth for special purposes. These are the works called *Ārchiṭa* in the *Praṇava-Vāḍa.* He added that of this first layer he had succeeded in finding and learning only the *Veḍa*-text itself and not the *Aṅgas* or *Upāṅgas;* and that what he found on these subjects were works of the second layer, reproductions of the first layer, in the same way as a subsequent crop is a reproduction of the first through the seeds left behind from the first, made by Ṛṣhis, progressed human jīvas, in accordance with the laws and the requirements of succeeding cycles of evolution.

Something of the kind is observable in the growth and decay of even recent literature. One main idea expressible in an aphorism is started by a thinker; expansions and commentaries embodying cognate ideas grow round it, till the bulk becomes insupportable; then abstracts and redactions begin, till the whole is reduced to a number of aphorisms, tables of contents, so to say; and then the whole process begins again. Careful divisions of sub-heads,

the demarcation of the more important from the less important, by means of larger and smaller types respectively, even the use of distinct aphorisms, is observable in modern scientific and philosophical literature, too, notably in German works.

To return to the manner of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa.* In the endeavour to make the inseparable connexion and the interdependence of all parts of the work, as of the World-process, perfectly unmistakable, there is an incessant reference throughout the book to the Logion and to facts and laws previously stated. This leads to repetition, which often becomes burdensome to a reader who does not specially delight in intellectual pugilism, and, either for want of leisure or of inclination, is desirous only to have the essential ideas clearly put before him, and willing to take the details on trust, without perpetual argumentation, or even to forego them altogether.

On the subject of these repetitions, and also of the digressions under which the book labours, the following facts may be noted:

It is well known that the Indian syllogism has five steps or propositions which deduce the desired conclusions from the necessary premises, and also include the induction which is the basis of the deduction. In it the conclusion appears twice, in the place of the first proposition as a

thesis *to be proved,* and again at the end as a thesis *proved.* It is the following of this method generally by the author of the work that produces in it what will appear to the reader in English, a cumbersome repetition. To the reader in Samskṛṭ it does not appear so very tedious; perhaps the repetition may sometimes give him even some intellectual pleasure, as carrying with it a sense of power, of "driving the conclusion home". I have omitted such repetition in the translation as far as possible.

Another cause of repetition is that after expounding a certain system of ideas in his own prose, the author sums them up in verses which, as said above, appear to be taken from more ancient writings, and string together the ideas in very abrupt fashion, almost by mere lists of single words, each expressing the most important element of an idea. These also I have largely omitted. On the other hand, the space thus gained by omissions has at least partly been spent in the numerous sentences or words that I have added within brackets where the sense of the author was made doubtful by the opposite defect of too much brevity.

As to digressions, a person looking cursorily into the paragraphs one after another, on page after page of the book, will perhaps think that he has never come across a more disjointed and disorderly collection of ideas. But if he will look

carefully at the ends and the beginnings of paragraphs in succession, he will generally discern a good transition made out. And at the end of the longest apparent digression he will unexpectedly find the author returning rigorously to the idea from which he seemed to have drifted away so completely.

But, even so, the reader will not be able to avoid feeling very frequently that the transition is made over a bridge constructed only of a word. That is to say, because a number of words have been used to describe an idea, any one of these words has been taken up at random, and an idea seemingly totally unrelated has been expounded therefrom simply because that word happens to have a place in the description of that idea also. But the connexion is not a merely superficial one. A very instructive psychological or metaphysical alliance between the ideas is hidden underneath the surface, in the etymology of the word, and is the reason why the word occurs in the description of the two seemingly disconnected ideas.

Finally, in connexion with the manner of the work, I would mention that the whole book is pervaded by an all-embracing charity and benevolence, by the highest possible ideas and conceptions of human life and evolution, by the constant aim of elevating the student and by an incessant endeavour to bring together and

harmonise and unify all possible differences of view, and show them as being due only to differences of standpoint. It rigorously eschews and deprecates discord to this extent that we do not meet with a single word even of polemical condemnation of any view. The ethical and metaphysical level of the work is so high that it has nothing in common with ordinary works of philosophy, but stands out rather as a scripture, wise and calm and earnestly compassionate.

With these eulogies on the merits of my author I pass on to a few observations as regards the nature of the present translation and summary.

VI.

The Nature of the Present Translation and Summary.

I began the translation into English of the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* shortly after the writing down of the original had been completed, that is to say in the summer of 1901, when I was staying in Shrīnagar, Kāshmīr, for a few months. I may mention here incidentally that I made enquiries there also, as one of the principal seats of Samskṛṭ learning in India, of many Paṇḍiṭs; but they too all professed entire ignorance about any such work as the *Praṇava-Vāḍa*. In Shrīnagar I completed only the translation of the preface and a few pages of the first section. Then, for various reasons, mainly that I was busy with *The Science of Peace* on the one hand and with work connected with the Central Hinḍū College, Benares, on the other, the translation was laid aside. On my return to Benares, I took it up again, but at the third section, which was the easiest to follow in point of language and also contained a large amount of varied information. About half of this section (which constitutes quite three-fourths of the whole work) I translated systematically. Then, getting a little tired of the mannerism, I took up portions here and there as I found them

interesting. This kind of work continued, with many long and short breaks caused by press of other unavoidable duties, till the whole was finished.

This method of work naturally left behind many defects. The portions that I took up first I translated in entirety and with greater adherence to the letter of the text. In those that I did later, as I became more and more familiar with the author's ways of thought and consequently more sure of the meaning of his language, I have thought more of the sense than of the word, more of the spirit than the letter, and have allowed myself a little more freedom in the use of the English language. In many places I have condensed or omitted altogether, in some paraphrased, in others expanded, in a few cases, especially those of the metrical hymns to the Absolute, I have used the text only as a basis. But in most cases where I have used words which are not directly justified by equivalent or corresponding words in the immediate text, though so justified by sentences occurring elsewhere, I have enclosed these words within brackets.

Finally I may mention that it was my intention at first to publish the translation and the text without any intermediate work, but I was advised by friends on whose judgment in such matters I rely, that a full summary in English

of the work would be more desirable to begin with. The present summary is the result. The remarks in which I have described the translation practically describe the summary also, with this difference, that the condensations are much more frequent, in all sections except the third. In the third I have made many more extracts from the full translation than in the other five, which do not give so many details of facts. With these extracts, indeed, I believe that the summary so fully reproduces and represents the original that a literal translation, even after omitting the palpable repetitions, would perhaps add little to the reader's information, and the publication of one may possibly be a waste of energy. However, this matter will be decided by the amount of interest that this summary arouses. If it succeeds in attracting attention, the next step ought to be the publication of the full original text.

BHAGAVĀN ḌĀS.

श्रेयस्कामस्तव नित्यं यतोऽसा-
वात्माऽन्वेषे श्रांतं त्वां च मन्यते ।
मुनिर्गिरां कारुणिकीं परामिमां
कल्याणार्थं तव तस्मात् संदिदेश ॥

नेयं गिरा कर्महीनेन लभ्या
न चाऽपि बोध्या योगमृते तपश्च ।
यं व्युपनीतं मात्रीयति तेन लभ्या
जगद्हृदयं विवृणुते तस्य चेयम् ॥

PRELIMINARY NOTE

by the translator.

(1) In this summary, words and sentences for which there is not a full or express equivalent in the original Samskṛṭ text of the Ṛṣhi Gārgyāyaṇa, but which are implied by the context and generally supported by express text elsewhere in the work, and which it has been thought desirable to add in order to bring out the sense fully or to supply a missing link in the chain of thought, are enclosed within brackets. A doubt as to the exact meaning of the text is marked by a query-sign, (?), within brackets also.

(2) All Samskṛṭ words with meanings translatable into English equivalents, begin with small type, like ordinary words, but are spaced out.

(3) All Samskṛṭ words which are proper names of individuals, places, etc., are printed like ordinary words but begin with capitals.

(4) All Samskṛṭ words which have a more or less translatable meaning, but indicate the Ultimates and Penultimates of the World-process begin with capitals and are also spaced out.

The corresponding English equivalents also begin with capitals.

(5) Names of books, or parts of books, or classes of literature, and verbal expressions of thought generally, are usually printed in italics, *e. g.*, *Ḍarshanas*, *Purāṇas*, *Veḍas*, *Mahāvākyas*, *Gāyaṭrī*, etc. But it has not been possible always to adhere to these rules rigorously.

(6) A U M is always printed in full capitals.

(7) While the endeavour has been generally to make the summary readable English, at times the manner of the original Samskṛṭ has been reproduced more exactly, to emphasise the way of the thought, or exhibit a peculiarity specially worthy of notice. Footnotes have been added to bring out the sense of the text in the more familiar terms and turns of thought of to-day; those very kindly contributed by Mrs. Annie Besant bear her initials in brackets at the end.

It may be noted here that this work is of interest mainly to those readers who attach value to the philosophical or metaphysical presentation of things, the 'thinking consideration' of the changes in incessant progress all around us; who wish to understand the world in terms of consciousness, of life, of the first person. And, further, it may be recalled to the mind of such readers that metaphysical ideas, by their very nature, are the reverse of 'precise' and 'clear-cut' in the sense in which concrete

sensuous facts are 'precise' or 'clear-cut.' When a reader therefore feels inclined to be impatient at the 'heaping together' of words which at first sight seem superfluous or hazy or inconsistent, he is requested to wait a while and by-and-by the justification, the mutual supplementation, the underlying connexion by means of a common notion, intangible but unmistakeable, will be felt by him. Metaphysic is 'completely-unified knowledge,' is the system of the ultimate 'laws' of nature traced down to One Law which holds together all 'facts.' The 'facts' are, or at least have the appearance of being, 'concrete' and 'precise'; the 'laws' are 'vague' and 'elastic,' to bind together the facts livingly.

PRAṆAVA-VĀḌA

BY

G Ā R G Y Ā Y A Ṇ A.

PREFACE

(*by Gārgyāyaṇa*).

This preface is more in the nature of a table of contents than a b h ū m i k ā proper, a 'ground-plan,' a foundation, an introduction showing the position of the subject-matter of the work among other subjects. The reason for this is that the work treats of the A U M, which (as has of course to be shown in the book) includes *everything*; and the *relative* words, ground-plan and super-structure, indicative of separate and mutually exclusive position are inappropriate in consequence; thus, the word 'ground-plan' would indicate something not included in, but outside of and leading up to the work.

I. The first section of the work deals with the synthesis and the analysis of the constituents of A U M. The A signifies Ā ṭ m ā, the Self, by opposition to the unity of which all the multitude of particulars is derived. For this very reason have we to begin with the Ā ṭ m ā. For, though it is true that the three constituents

of the AUM are in constant conjunction, and there cannot be any *order* of precedence and succedence between things thus constantly conjoined, still, the *description* of even such things belongs inevitably to the realm of the successive. And if we must begin with some one thing, and pass on in succession to talk of others, and cannot talk of all things at once, then the Self, the nearest to us, is naturally the most appropriate with which to make a commencement.

Having begun with the Self, we pass on to the Not-Self, indicated by the U, and then to the relation between them, the relation of Negation of one another, denoted by the M. The Necessity, the Energy, the principle of the successive conjunction and disjunction of the Self and the Not-Self in and by the Negation, is expressed by the symbolic letter I, which lies hidden in the other three, in coalescence with them, in universal world-fact as well as in the particular language of Samskṛṭ according to the archaic rules of its grammar.[1]

---

[1] See *infra*, Section III, Ch. XVIII, for an explanation of this. It should be noted that the I mentioned here is not the English *word* I, meaning the Self, but the Samskṛṭ *letter*, इ, in the same way as A, U, and M, are the Samskṛṭ अ, उ, म, which in their coalescence make up the sacred sound ॐ, AUM, generally pronounced OM.

These four, A, U, M, and I, which together make up AUM, respectively correspond to cognition, desire, action, and the summation of them all. And because the first section of this work treats in a general way of these all-embracing facts, therefore it may be said to include in itself all the contents of the whole work.

Having given the general outlines of the nature of the three patent factors of the AUM, the first section goes on to lay down some wide-reaching principles.

The nature of the AUM is transcendental. It is comparable to the World-process with which, indeed, it is, in a certain sense, identical, because it transcends all limitations, and the *whole* of its contents and details is *endless*, and may not be encompassed by any finite individual. Gods upon gods, Mahā-Vishṇu and ever higher and higher deities, comprehend only larger and larger masses of it in an endless seeking.

This illimitability of the succession of the World-process is but a reflexion, in the Many, of the unlimitedness, the transcendence of all limitations, of the One Self. And this illimitability appears and reappears in each atom, each one of the many, so that it is impossible to fix a first beginning and a last end for anything.

The Science of the AUM, the order of succession of its three factors, is coeval with the

World-process and comes down to us by a beginningless tradition. Mahā-Vishṇu himself first learnt the A, and then the other letters, and then the words formed out of them, all preceded by the AUM. All the s h ā s ṭ r a s, sciences, begin with it. Hence the study of the AUM should precede every other study. And therein, again, precedence should be given to the study of the p r a k ṛ ṭ i, *i. e.* the original, simple, unmodified nature of the constituents, and sequence given to the study of their s a n ḍ h i or coalescence. Hence this first section is named the *Sanḍhi-Prakṛṭi-Prakaraṇa.*

II. The principles, causes, or natural constitutions, which result in y o g a or mutual relation, and the p r a k ā r a or manner of these conjunctions and interdependences, between all things, despite their v i b h ā g a or separateness, are dealt with in the second section called the *Yoga-Prakāra-Prakaraṇa.* The order or succession which is implied in these relations, and the methods and laws which in turn are implied in the succession, are also dealt with. And cognition and desire are also treated of in connexion with them.

III. The third section, the *Kriyā-Prakaraṇa,* is the largest in the work. It covers three-fourths of the whole and is sub-divided into many parts and chapters. It deals with action,

which presupposes cognition and desire. And for this same reason, in this section, the whole circle of knowledge and all the shāsṭras or sciences are outlined. The seed and origin of all things whatsoever that are to be found in the World-process is traced back into the AUM, and shown as present in the interplay of the Self and the Not-Self, the Limited and the Unlimited; and, finally, the nature of action and reaction, actor, instrument, object, motive, etc., is explained.

In connexion with the element of knowledge or cognition involved in action, there are described herein the successive evolution, from the AUM, of the *Gāyaṭrī* and the *Mahā-vākyas*, the *Veḍas*, the *Aṅgas*, the *Upāṅgas*, etc. Then follow considerations as to volition, *i.e.*, desire in action, active desire. Then numbers are spoken of as lying at the root of manifest action proper, the creation of the worlds. Afterwards, the seven root-elements, their qualities and activities, and their dissolution and repeated formation are mentioned.

IV. The section following the above, called the *Sṛṣhty-aikaḍeshika-Prakaraṇa*, very briefly mentions the broad outlines of the evolution of our own particular world-system, our brahmāṇḍa, in the mineral, the vegetable, the animal with their chiṭras (pictures, shadows,

or astral duplicates), the chanḍrāṭmā[1] (lunar?) and two other intervening kingdoms, and finally the human kingdom. It touches upon the constitution of the human organism also. The subtler or elemental evolutions preceding the mineral are only passingly alluded to.

V. The fifth section is entitled the *Manṭavy-Āmanṭavya-Prakaraṇa,* the thinkable and the unthinkable, or the believable and the unbelievable. It discusses the nature of existence and non-existence, transcendence (of the experiential or empirical, the concrete, the limited, the particular and successive), and non-transcendence, necessity and non-necessity, *i. e.*, chance or accidentality or contingency, etc., and explains what to believe and do, and also how (from the standpoint of the whole) there is nothing unbelievable or undoable. It points out how everything whatsoever has its own proper place in the Universal Nature of Brahman, the Absolute, and how separateness is included in the Non-separate.

[1] The theosophical books give seven kingdoms in the chain of globes in which our earth forms one; three elemental kingdoms—in which matter is being shaped into the requisite density and acquires the necessary attributes for the visible kingdoms—one mineral kingdom, one vegetable, one animal, one human. It is not clear what is meant by the

VI. In the last section the oneness of all things is shown. All acts and facts are synthesised in the One. Mokṣha, liberation, is explained as being the abolition and Negation of all the 'particulars' of the World-process in the fullness, the allness and the unity of the Self. The mukṭa, the liberated, the emancipated, realises the mutual abolition of all things by each other in pairs.

VII. The whole of the work may be regarded as the completing seventh which sums up all the six sections.

The immediate occasion for the composition of the work of which the contents have been indicated above may now be noted.

The Science of the *Praṇava* is necessary at the very outset of all study, because only by means of it are the reconciliation and synthesis of all sciences possible. Without the help of this supreme and all comprehensive science, the various sciences, which are but parts of it, appear as disjointed, separate, independent and even mutually contradictory, as is shown in the *Nyāya* system of philosophy. For

---

Chanḍrāṭmā and two other kingdoms, between the animal and the human; allusion may possibly be made here to the Lunar Piṭṛs, who gave their chhāyās as model for the human form, since they may be said to intervene, in a sense, between the animal and the human kingdoms. (A. B.)

this reason larger and smaller works on the Science of the AUM have been written and used in all times, according to the needs and capacities of the races concerned, and the special requirements of each cycle. *Praṇava-vivēchinī*, *Praṇava-prabhā*, and *Praṇava-pradīpikā* are previous works on the same subject, of very small extent and fit for the study of children. There is the great *Praṇavārṇava* [1] also on the other hand. The present work named *Praṇava-vāḍa*, has an extent of sixteen thousand shloka-measures,[2] and has been written in order to convey to youthful students some general knowledge of the science so far as I myself have been able feebly to gather it from ancient works.

I pray that the many shortcomings of the work be forgiven and I earnestly exhort all to study this illuminating science, in some way or other, as it is the very root of the knowledge contained in the *Veḍas* with their *Aṅgas* and *Upāṅgas* and is the only means of realising the true Unity of all things and beings.

---

[1] Said by Pt. Ḍhanarāja to be the work of Shiva himself and to extend over two hundred thousand shloka-measures.

[2] A 'shloka-measure' technically means thirty-two syllables; four quarters, of eight syllables each, make up one shloka in the anushtup metre, which is the most common in Samskṛṭ literature.

SECTION I.

Sandhi-Prakṛṭi-Prakaraṇa.[1]

THE ULTIMATES IN THEIR PRIMAL NATURE AND THEIR COALESCENCE.

A as the Self.—U as the Not-Self.—M as the relation of Negation between them.—The tri-unity of the World-process, and the triplicity of every factor of it.—Illustrations.

The purpose of this work is to explain the World-process, the laws that govern it, the order that prevails in it, and the necessity of every factor of it—all as contained in and evolving out of the sacred three-lettered word-sound AUM.

This world is triple everywhere, in all its departments. Thus, we have: being, non-being, and their mutual pervasion, *i.e.*, becoming; three kinds of g u ṇ a s or attributes; three kinds of time; three main objects of enquiry, P r a k ṛ ṭ i, matter, nature, J ī v ā ṭ m ā, the individual ego, and P a r a m ā ṭ m ā, the Supreme

[1] It would probably be better for the reader to begin with Section II, and for the time at least, omit this first Section which is rather like a string of aphorisms, uninteresting in the absence of explanatory comment.

Ego; birth, life and death, etc. This trilateral trinity or triplicity of the world is embodied in the three-lettered AUM [1].

---

[1] The reader should realise that the triplicity of the universe is based on the fundamental trinity of the Self, the Not-Self, and the Relation between them, with the summation of the three, the All, Brahman, forming the Tetractys, or the Abstract Quaternary. This is again reflected continually on the lower planes, and the unifying process constantly consists in finding the summation, and in self-identification with it, so that the trinity becomes the quaternary, and the quaternary is realised as the One. It is well also to remember that the intervening Duad has numberless representations in nature; the One—Brahman—gives rise to Two—Praṭyagāṭmā and Mūlaprakṛṭi—and the Two, by juxta-position, inevitably become the Three—the Relation between them forming the third factor; then these Three are summed up as the Four—Brahman making the Tetraktys. From these comes the concrete world-system, the Fifth, itself in all its manifestations being five-fold, each manifestation containing the five elements. In these the Self as jīva makes the Sixth, the Fifth and the Sixth being thus reflected from the Not-Self and the Self; and when to these is added the reflexion from the third, the Relation, the Seven are completed. These numbers carefully pondered, are the key to the Universe (A. B.).

A primarily stands for Ā ṭ m ā, the Self; U for A n-ā ṭ m ā, the Not-Self; and M for the N i ṣ h e ḍ h a, the Negation which is the relation, the bond, between them.

The successive conjunction and disjunction of the three, A, U, and M, are not real but only apparent; and they *appear* in rotation because of the necessity of *succession* in the *limited* U. Otherwise, from the standpoint of the Whole, there is only a constant simultaneity. This may be illustrated by the coalescence of letter sounds in grammar, though, obviously, no exact illustration of the Whole is possible by a part only. Single words, in grammar, correspond to the A; a sentence consisting of many words, to U; and the relation (*i.e.*, the speaker's intention) in which the words are held together in the sentence, to M.

The vowel A (as is clearly seen in the Samskṛṭ alphabet) coalesces with and is present in every other vowel sound and letter, and without it nothing is pronouncible. In order that any sound may manifest, A must combine with it. So is the Self present in everything, and without it no manifestation can take place. Thus interdependent are j ī v a and ḍ e h a, individual spirit or ego and body. They are each within the other, mutually immanent, as seed and plant.

Because of this conjuction and disjunction in succession, the fact of the order of first and

second, etc., arises. The Self and the Not-Self are first and second and *vice versa*, from the standpoint of the one and the other respectively. But it must be remembered, all along, that there is no real succession, no paraspara-ṭva, no other-and-other-ness in the eternally joined, just as, *e.g.*, there is none in the subordinate but more familiar trinity of substance, attribute and movement.

The coalescence of two things is possible only when and because the 'being' underlying them both is one and the same. If the essence were not common, connection were not possible. Saṭṭā, being, is that vyāpāra, operation, which goes along with, is favourable to, or is of the nature of, the ḍhāraṇā, the maintenance, of the self, the individuality[1]. And, thus, Self and Samsāra, the World-process, are the same. The apparently new and different sound formed by the coalescence of two other sounds is not in reality 'other' than those.

---

[1] आत्मधारणानुकूलव्यापारः सत्ता "Being (or rather existence) is self-assertion." Compare Spinoza's statements: Everything, so far as it is in itself, endeavors to persist in its own being (*Ethics*, iii. 6); the endeavor wherewith everything endeavors to persist in its own being is nothing else than the actual essence of the thing itself (iii. 7), etc. Physically, the ex-istence and self-assertion of all things is pseudo-infinite radiation or self-multiplication. See *The Science of Peace*, p. 239 and p. 268.

Every coalescence, relation, conjunction of different things is essentially a denial of their difference. Hence the coalesced sound, AUM, which is the symbol of Brahman, is denial of the Many (as other than and separate or apart from the One) and an assertion of the fact that all is but One and the same. The significance of the *Veḍa*-text, 'May I become many,' is only this, that the One and the Many are the same. If many plants arise from one seed, and many seeds from one plant, where is the difference between seed and plant? Because they are not different in reality therefore is a combination, a mutual reproduction, of them possible.

The following illustrations may be considered: The past and the future appear as opposed to and different from each other, yet neither of them *is*; only the present *is*, and it implies both the past and the future. Greatness and smallness, again, appear as hopelessly opposed; yet neither is anything in reality; what is great from one standpoint, that same thing is small from another. AUM, the 'indeclinable,' the unperishing, includes all differing things and abolishes all differences[1].

[1] As a first step, the words 'separate' and 'separateness' may be substituted for 'different' and 'difference'. With respect to many things, it is quite obvious that they are inseparable, even though distinguishable, like back and front. Later on, the

In the philosophy of grammar it is pointed out that sanḍhi, coalescence, is threefold[1] like everything else. Amongst words verbs correspond to U, the Not-Self, and nouns to A, the Self; they are all mutually connected (by the prepositional terminations corresponding to M) endlessly.

'End' and 'Endless,' again, are the same, for the true Endless is beyond number and time, and what only *appears* to us as endless, in the successive, has always ends in reality which are to be found if properly and sufficiently traced.

---

further step may be taken that even such difference as is implied in distinguishability is also only 'hypothetical,' 'imaginary,' 'illusory,' etc.

[1] Samskṛṭ grammar sub-divides sanḍhi into three kinds, (i) between vowels, (ii) between consonants, and (iii) prakṛṭi-sanḍhi, certain transformations of aspirates, etc. In order to understand why there are constant references to grammatical considerations in a metaphysical work, some such consideration as the following has to be borne in mind: "Any attempt to determine the history of word-formation must begin with an extensive survey of the actual processes of creation . . ." (*Harmsworth's Encyclopædia*, Art: Philology.) Thought, thing and language evolve and 'proceed' side by side and the history of any one throws light on the history of the others. See *infra*, Sec. III, chapter XIII., for details as to the Science of Language, generally.

The true endless is B r a h m a n which is described in the Upanishaṭs as 'Truth, Knowledge, and Endlessness,' these three corresponding respectively to A, U, and M, or the Self, the Not-Self, and the Relation between them. The three consitute B r a h m a n only when all of them are taken together. Hence, when it is said that Āṭmā is omnipotent, what is really implied is that the potencies of all three are conjoined; and the separate and exclusive mention of Āṭmā is intended simply to show that the manifestation of the potencies is possible only in apparent separateness. That Negation, the third factor, is and has a potency is clear from the fact that 'to *not* do,' to refrain from doing, is also a power.

We see thus that because B r a h m a n is tri-une, all the World-process which is within and is identical with B r a h m a n is also triple. The illustrations are endless. We have already seen that s a n ḍ h i or coalescence is triple. Gender is also triple, masculine, feminine and neuter, and each of these again reproduces all the three. Substance, quality and movement make a triplet, one member of which is born from another, though all are simultaneous also.

The meaning of 'Enquiry after B r a h m a n' is nothing else than the wish to know precisely the nature of the three factors that make up the

World-process, Self, Not-Self and the Relation between them.

The procedure of all shāsṭras, sciences, is, briefly, this: Having known such and such things as separate, in their diversity, let us know them as one, in their unity, in their relations with each other whereby they are bound together and make an organic unity[1].

Thus, the science of ethics teaches that having known ḍharma, arṭha, and karma, 'duty, profit, and pleasure,' separately, we have finally to know them as one, as constituting mokṣha, freedom, in their harmonised, balanced and unified observance.

So again, nyāya, the 'leading' of proof, the 'marshalling' of evidence, tells us that pramāṇa, prameya, and samshaya, evidence, fact, and doubt, which we treat ordinarily as separate, are synthesised in the prayojana, motive or final aim and object, which, ultimately and essentially and always, is knowledge of Brahman. These four indeed constitute the true inner meaning of the four well-known qualifications of the enquirers after Brahman. (They state in terms of intellect or logic and psychology

[1] Modern writers, like Jevons, in his *Principles of Science*, and Karl Pearson, in *The Grammar of Science*, recognise the same fact, saying that the business of Science is to trace unity in diversity, to sum up details in laws, etc.

what the other four indicate in terms of emotion or ethic. Samshaya or doubt corresponds to vairāgya or dissatisfaction with the world; prameya or fact with viveka or discrimination between the real and the unreal; pramāṇa or evidence to shama, etc., the means of ascertainment, and prayojana is clearly mumukṣhā, longing for liberation). Another triplet, subordinate to and summed up in the prayōjana, is that of kriyā, kāraṇa, and karṭā, effect, cause, and the efficient actor. (*Nyāya*, the science of 'conducting' thought justly.)

These last three again correspond to Jīva, Brahman and Māyā (in the vedanṭa, the 'final knowledge'). Māyā is Samsāra, the World-process, the Not-Self; Jīva is the Aṭmā, the Self; and Brahman, from one standpoint, corresponds to the Negation, the relation between them, regarded as including both the related factors. (*Vedanṭa*, the science of the 'final knowledge'.)

Other instances may be mentioned:

Chiṭṭa, the mind; vṛṭṭi, its modifications; and nirodha, their restraint, control or inhibition; are all summed up in yoga, the 'junction, mergence, union' of knower and known in and through jñāna, knowledge. (*Yoga*, the science of 'combination'.)

Sāṅkhya, the 'Numberless,' is the summation of the triplet of Prakṛṭi, Infinite nature,

Puruṣha, Spirit or Ego, and Brahman, the Absolute, the Numberless, the beyond number. (*Sāṅkhya*, the science of 'enumeration'.)

Mīmāmsā, 'repeated examination within the mind,' synthesises the triplet of karṭavya, akarṭavya and bhinna, the to be done, the to be avoided, and the different or separate from both; and, again, the triplet of svārṭha, parārṭha and paramārṭha, 'self-interest' or egoism, 'other-interest' or altruism, and 'supreme-interest' or universalism, duty pure and simple. (*Mīmāmsā*, the science of 'interpreting the intention'.)

Vaisheṣhika, 'specification,' deals with the triplets of ḍravya, guṇa, and karma, substance, attribute and movement, and of sāmānya, genus or universality, visheṣha, species, speciality, individuality, particularity or rather singularity, and samavaya, juxtaposition, or the subsumption, immanence, relation and inseparable connexion, of one under or in or with another. (*Vaisheṣhika*, the science of 'specification and classification'.)

Such are some of the most important triplets of the World-process which reproduce and reflect the nature of Brahman, and form the subject-matter of the six *Aṅgas* and *Upaṅgās*, 'limbs' and 'subsidiary limbs,' of the *Veḍa*, the sciences whereby the infinite nature of Brahman may be comprehended.

SECTION II.

Yoga-Prakāra-Prakaraṇa.

THE METHODS OF THE CONJUNCTION OF THE THREE FACTORS.

The importance and the consequences of the knowledge of Brahman as tri-une.—Further illustrations of the triplicity.—Cognition, action and desire as corresponding to A, U and M.—The multifarious triplets arising under desire and action.

The manifestation of the trinity which constitutes the one or, rather, the numberless Brahman, is Samsāra, the World-process, so that we may say that Samsāra in its totality is Brahman; and the endless combinations and permutations of the three factors make the many ways or methods or laws of this manifestation or 'becoming' which is Samsāra.

These many methods have to be studied by every one who would understand the real significance of Brahman. And they have to be studied in the World-process itself, that is to say, by observation of it all around us. For there is no greater teacher than this World-process itself, and study thereof is the real and genuine ṭapas and yoga, austerity and self-development. To know *all* is to know Brahman. It should be borne in mind however that to know all, in the

totality of its endless detail, is not achievable in any limited space and time by any being limited by space and time. Only the *All* itself knows the *all*. Various sciences study only various aspects of Brahman or Samsāra. What is needed and is possible is that the student should secure a general idea of the whole and of its unity. Such knowledge is the source of that deliberate and true altruism which arises necessarily in the jīva which has attained to nivṛṭṭi and universalism.[1]

Altruism and egoism, the gain of one and the loss of another, renunciation by one and acceptance by another, sin and merit, heaven and hell, destruction and protection, all have their own separate and proper places in the World-process, from the standpoint of the limited, though they all are as one from the standpoint of the One Self.

It is only when the jīva realises the illusoriness of the separateness of jīvas from each other, the separateness of many selves, which is the sole basis of the distinctions of sin and merit, that it becomes capable of the performance of desireless action, work without attachment, duty

[1] 'Universalism' is here used to indicate the position of one who has transcended both egoism and altruism, who knows no longer 'myself and others,' but sees himself and others as one with the Universal Self. (A. B.)

for the sake of duty, and so becomes a participant in mukṭi, liberation, the true deliverance of the soul, which is deliverance from selfish desire and so from all possibility of suffering.

The jīva that has realised this underlying unity of the diverse world transcends and transmutes selfishness and unselfishness into duty; the elations of health and the depressions of disease into the steady equability of perfect life; regularity and irregularity into living and flexible routine; deprivations and gifts into the justice that is ever adjusting the balance of all things by means of punishments and rewards. Such a jīva realises the synthesis, the unity, of the four objects of life, *viz.*, profit, pleasure, duty and deliverance. It knows that the opposites that make up the world are ever changing place, poison becoming medicine and medicine poison, with changing circumstances.

But before it can realise this unity it must have studied the diversity which is pervaded by that unity. The very transcendence, by Brahman, of time and number, implies time and number. The Beginningless and Endless is made up of the countless and incessant beginnings and endings, of the periods and cycles, which the world uses as the measures of time.

Here, again, we may notice the ever-present triplicity of the world. The beginning is the A, the end is the U, and the intervening middle

period of maintenance or preservation is the connecting M. So the present is the A, the future U, and the past M.[1] The unfinished beginning is the present; the remainder after its completion is the future; the remainder after the end is the past. The present includes both past and future. Divisor, dividend and quotient; multiplier, multiplicand and multiple; addition corresponding to growth or creation or origin, multiplication to preservation, and (subtraction or) division to destruction and end—all these are instances of the same triplicity.[2] The

---

[1] The curious transpositions of the letters of the *Praṇava*, as here given, seem to be of the nature of the transpositions often used in ancient works, to indicate certain successions within certain periods. Thus, while A U M would indicate the World-process ideally, the two factors having prominence, and the relation between them coming last, as being hidden, the anagram A M U would indicate the world really, the relation taking its actual place as between the Self and the Not-Self; and M A U would indicate by the necessary emphasis on the vowel sound and the equally necessary swift passage from the M, the relation of the past to the present, and the gliding passage from present to future. (A. B.) See *The Science of Peace*, p. 139.

[2] The book does not explain why subtraction is omitted. From one point of view it might appear that addition, including multiplication, would corres-

singular, the dual, the plural, 1, 2, and 3, also respectively correspond to A, U, and M. The cause and the summation and the tri-unity of them all is the cipher. By a process of reflexion of the trinity in each of these, each of the three primal numbers becomes triple, and hence we have the nine figures, for this world-system, the tenth being 'no-thing,' nothing new or further, and so made up with the zero.

The above observations shew the intimate connexion between number and time, the full application of which is found in the science of jyoṭiṣha, or 'the lights (of heaven),' *i.e.*, *(Jyoṭiṣha)* astrology and astronomy, with its elaborate measurements and calculations, and considerations of good and evil times and proper and improper seasons; for, as there are right and wrong seasons for agricultural processes, so are there for all works and undertakings whatsoever.

Time corresponds to the Self, number to the Not-Self, and the saṅkhya, the calculus of the numberless infinite, (or rather in-de-finite or pseudo-in-finite) to the relation between them.

There are three principal grahas, planets, and nine altogether (for our world-system, in correspondence with the nine numbers).

---

pond with creation; subtraction, including division, with destruction; and the 'rule of three', connecting the two, with preservation.

Nāsṭika, āsṭika, and māsṭika, atheism, theism, and polytheism, literally the believer that (a thing, a being, a deity) is not, the believer that it is, and the believer that the negation (or the negated many) is—this is another important trinity.

In considering these triplets we observe how the multitudinous Samsāra originates and is within the non-separate Brahman; how rest and effort, undertaking and completion, alternate within the Full and Changeless. All 'becoming' is effort, is accompanied with the sense of individual initiative and effort; and, at the same time, all 'becoming' is necessary also. As all the successive progression of inference is based on and included in direct cognition or intuition, so the corresponding procession of Samsāra, the before and after of which is connected together in our consciousness by inference after being separately gathered by direct cognition,[1] is based on and included in the direct cognition or intuition or single and partless consciousness of all the three factors of the primal trinity, 'I—Not-I—Not'. The *feeling of effort* is a *necessary* error. Truth and error are relative and both necessary, being both summed up in illusion.

[1] The latest way of describing this 'separate gathering' is that 'each presentation is new and unique.' (*Vide*, *Mind*, for January, 1906, p. 53).

P r a ṭ y a k ṣ h a, 'vision,' direct cognition, intuition, presentation, corresponds to the present; a n u m e y a, what has to be inferred, to the past: and p r a y o j a n a, the motive of the inference, to the future. Again, from the standpoint of Ā ṭ m ā p r a ṭ y a k ṣ h a corresponds to A; n i r ṇ a y a, judgment or decisive conclusion or deductive inference, to U; and a n u m ā n a, reasoning or inductive inference, to M. But, from the standpoint of S a m s ā r a, n i r ṇ a y a corresponds to A, and p r a ṭ y a k ṣ h a to U.

All the six p a ḍ ā r ṭ h a s, 'meanings of words', 'objects aimed at, or intended to be reached or expressed', things or categories, of the *Vaisheṣhika* system, and the sixteen of the *Nyāya* system (for which definite numbers there are definite reasons) are respectively reducible to (i) b h ā v a, being (corresponding to matter and s a ṭ) and (ii) p r a ṭ y a k ṣ h a, direct knowledge (corresponding to c h i ṭ and spirit or consciousness), which, again, are in and are B r a h m a n which is and wherein is (iii) b h a v a n a, 'becoming' (connected with effort and desire and ā n a n ḍ a or bliss).[1]

[1] Further details regarding the various systems of philosophy and the different 'points of view' of these ḍ a r s h a n a s (*Ḍarshanas*), will be found later on in Section III. Ch. xiv., *et seq.*

As said before, all 'becoming' is necessary, from the standpoint of the All, and yet every particular 'becoming' invariably manifests by means of desire. This desire, self-determination, individual initiation of actions, is all illusory, technically, though an indubitable fact also at the same time.

Āṭmā, and Samsāra, Self and the World-process or the Not-Self, are determinant of, are so to say causes or motives for or to, each other, and are always in inseparable connexion with each other. And hence jīva, individualised self, soul, or spirit, and ḍeha or body are interdependent and mutually relative, even as north and south and east and west are. 'This is thine,' 'this is mine,' means temporary connexion. 'Thou art I,' is permanent connexion.

The inner identity of past, present, and future is the real cause of the conviction that what *was*, *is*, and also *will be*. So too are possible and impossible identified (in the conditional). Bheḍa or separateness, abheḍa or non-separateness, and anabheḍa or non-in-separateness; asṭi, nāsṭi, anāsṭi, is, is not, not is; aboḍha, samboḍha, viboḍha, ignorance, knowledge, special knowledge, etc.; are other such triplets.

Some idea of the general principle of tri-unity and the method of development and multiplication by mutual reflexion having been supplied as above, a few special considerations as regards

ichchhā or desire and jñāna or cognition may be entered upon, the discussion of kriyā or action being left over for the next section.

While the whole is always full and complete, each part is not such. We thus have an absence of fullness, an imperfection, noticeable in any and every part, howsoever we take it, of Samsāra. At the same time, every jīva, being identical with the Self, is identical with the whole, and contains all within itself. The result of this double identity of the jīva, with the whole (Self) on the one hand and with a part (of the Not-Self) on the other, is, that there is necessarily and inevitably an incessant progression in each part towards the fullness of the Whole. And, as said before, the constant co-efficient of this necessary evolution is desire.

The main significance of all blessings, etc., is to be found in this fact of inevitable progress. He who blesses knows that the desire having arisen, in the person blessed, for a certain higher condition, that condition *will* evolve in him in the course of time, and *declares* this fact in his blessing.

By mutual reflexions, cognition, desire and action become triple, each of them, in their turn.

Ichchhā,[1] desire, is subdivided into kāmanā kāṅkṣhā, and āshā; and cognition into

[1] Etymologically it would be better to translate ichchhā by 'wish,' both words being derived from

saṅkalpa, vikalpa, and aḍhyavasāya.[1] It must be borne in mind all along, however, that all these are sub-divisions of one and the

---

the same root iṣh. But usage in western treatises on psychology has made 'desire' technically the more appropriate. As a general rule, it is difficult to assign exact English equivalents to Samskṛṭ philosophical terms. The different sub-races which have built up the technical terminologies of philosophy in the different languages, have looked at the things, the same things, from different standpoints, and so caught and embodied into words *different aspects* of these things. The equivalents used in this translation are therefore only suggestive. Uniformity in their use will not be possible to observe always, though, of course, it will be striven after. It is well-known that definiteness of language grows hand-in-hand with definiteness of ideas, and as the one is often a very lengthy process, so must be the other.

[1] All these terms are dealt with more fully, later on, in the text, with the exception of the last, aḍhyavasāya, in place of which anukalpa is substituted as the third of the triplet. The psychological distinctions made here between the four aspects of desire are not to be found at all in current Samskṛṭ works; nor is anukalpa to be met with there in the sense assigned to it here. Saṅkalpa, vikalpa, and aḍhyavasāya are current, however, in the sense, generally speaking, of plan or resolve, doubt or alternative, and final determination, respectively.

same consciousness, and are, hence, identical in essence.

Kāmanā corresponds to asṭi-ṭva, existence, is-ness; it is the desire to *ex-ist*, to manifest outwards. Nishkāmya,[1] on the other hand, corresponds to saṭṭā, being, inwardness, 'absence of desire (to manifest outwards).'[2] Kāmanā appears as syāṭ, syāh, syām, 'may he be, may thou be, may I be (or become such and such).' The three correspond to M, U, and A respectively. But from another standpoint, the root as, to exist, (which is the root of both saṭṭā and asṭi-ṭva) includes all the three forms, syāṭ, syāh and syām, of kāmanā; and in this root, the letter *a* corresponds to the Āṭmā; and the letter *s* to the bahu, the Many, the world or U; while M or the Negation is represented by saṭṭā, being, which is the underlying meaning of the root as and the connecting link between the Āṭmā and the Many. The primal wish, as embodied in the *Veḍa*-text, is therefore bahu-syām, 'May I become many.'

---

[1] Modern Samskṛṭ would say naishkāmya.

[2] The distinction implied between asṭi-ṭva and saṭṭā is worth noting. In current Samskṛṭ philosophical literature, Prashasṭapāḍa's *Vaisheshika-Bhāshya* assigns asṭi-ṭva to all six paḍārṭhas and saṭṭā to only the first three. Available commentaries and modern pandiṭs do not explain the difference, at least not satisfactorily.

In the general sense, kāmanā may be said to correspond to the Self, to be the desire for self-manifestation, self-realisation, self-assertion. And if it is thus looked at, we see that all the other sub-divisions fall within it.

Kāṅkṣhā may be distinguished from kāmanā thus: kāmanā is the mere naked wish for self-realisation; kāṅkṣhā is the wish for such *by means of* the many. The reference to the many, the desire to manifest in and through the many, is the speciality of kāṅkṣhā. In kāṅkṣhā is present the striving for the fruit; kāṅkṣhā is only for the sake of fruit. In what way, by what means, can this object be gained—such wishful cogitation is the work of kāṅkṣhā. That shakṭi, energy or power, that self-effort, the form or nature of which is the becoming, the coming about, or the bringing about, of the fruit or the wished-for result, the gradual securing of the object—that is kāṅkṣhā, (conation?).

Ichchhā, wish, desire, is the suggestor of the method. May it be, it may be, that this result 'becomes' or is brought about by this means—such is its form. ("The wish is father to the thought," "Necessity is the mother of invention".)

Āshā, hope, refers to the future—because such an object is being secured now by such means, and has also been gained similarly in the

past, therefore it *will be* gained in the same way in the future also.

The cognition corresponding to āshā is saṅkalpa. Its form is: I shall do this, or let me do this, or I am doing this, with the knowledge and in the belief that thereby such a result will be obtained. Āshā and saṅkalpa are related as effect and cause[1]. The former is of the form of or corresponds to the *Nyāya*-category of nirṇaya, decision, deduction; and the latter to that of siḍḍhānṭa, established and settled conclusion.[2]

---

[1] It may at first sight seem that the reverse is the case, that hope is the cause and resolve the effect, that we resolve to do something only when we hope that it will produce the wished-for result. This would be so if the words hope and resolve are taken in their exact English sense. But in that sense they are not exact equivalents of āshā and saṅkalpa. The latter should be taken here more as "plan" than resolve; then it becomes easier to see that we hope for a certain occurrence in *consequence* of our plan; without the plan for the realising of it we would not have the hope of the occurrence.

[2] The endless interlacing of these moods of consciousness is at first sight very perplexing, but as the reader proceeds further with the work and realises how this endlessness of detail within detail is the normal condition of all things everywhere, he will become reconciled to this particular perplexity also.

In other words, May I be—is kāmanā; I am—is kāṅkṣhā; I was—is ichchhā; I shall be—is āshā.

Vikalpa, doubt, alternative, is the negator, the opposite of saṅkalpa. Doubt, uncertainty,

As a general rule, it may be said, for psychological purposes, that the order of succession is, first cognition, then desire, then action; and that the sub-divisions of these follow the same order. Thus if cognition is C and sub-division of it c, and so with the others, then taking only one set of sub-divisions, the order of succession would probably be; Cc, Dc, Ac, Cd, Dd, Ad, Ca, Da, Aa, or Cc, Cd, Ca, Dc, Dd, Da, Ac, Ad, Aa, or all three at a time (in three different degrees), and so on. Looked at thus, the fact appears to be that where we say that the wish is father to the thought which results in such and such an action, or that necessity is the mother of invention, the 'thought' or 'invention' is not a cognition following after a desire, but is either the Ca, or the Ac, a *plan* of *action*, a mixture of cognitive and active elements, which *follows* Dd and precedes Aa. In the realm of the successive, in actual daily life, it does not seem easy to find a case of simple and specific cognition, Cc, coming after and arising out of a simple and specific desire, Dd. The latter *pre*-supposes the former; the former entails the latter.

The growth of these complications, the opening up of these ramifications, in the individual, under the stress of the outward-going desire for the

attaches to everything; I am or I was or I shall be so and so—all this has an element of uncertainty about it; we are never positively sure even of the accuracy of our present experience, less so of our recollection of the past, much less

---

revivification of 'stale pleasure,' or the enhancement and elaboration of pleasure by complex arrangements of objects of pleasure, is the growth of memory, intelligence, etc.; it is evolution generally. Compare the simple satisfaction of the primal appetites for food and sex in the animal with the complex satisfaction of those *same* appetites by civilised man with the help and subservience of all the apparatus of modern civilisation. After the middle stage, that of satiation and self-consciousness, there sets in the inward-turning of the desire, the negation of these things; and the *apparent* superiority of the nivṛṭṭi-condition as such consists in *remembering* the experiences of pravṛṭṭi and yet deliberately rejecting them, 'rising superior' to them. At the stage of self-consciousness (not all-self-consciousness) karma and punishment become substituted for cause and effect—a change of *names* only. See Section VI, *infra.* The rotation of the three aspects of consciousness is also repeatedly touched upon in the work, and the difficulty is solved by distinguishing between 'generic' and 'specific' forms of each. For concrete illustrations of Cc, etc., we may tentatively take the following:—

(Cc) Cognition-proper, definite knowledge, aḍhyavasāya, 'This is a fruit' 'I see this fruit.'

of our future. This is due to the presence of the Negation everywhere.

The potential syām, 'may I be,' as Time, includes all the other three, am, was, and will be, or present, past and future.

These four divisions of desire occur in every possible variation of krama, order; but the natural one is kāmanā, ichchhā, kāṅkṣhā. and āshā. The others are the opposite of

---

(Cd) Cognition-desire, vikalpa, doubt, 'Is it worth tasting?' 'It seems to be nice?' 'May I have it?' 'It is probably good to eat?'

(Ca) Cognition-action, resolution, determination, saṅkalpa, 'I ought to be and am taking it.'

(Dc) Desire-cognition, kāṅkṣhā, 'It seems to be obtainable,' 'It looks as if I could get it.'

(Dd) Desire-proper, kāmanā, the longing for it, 'I want the fruit'.

(Da) Desire-action, āshā, hope, expectation and volition, 'I expect I will secure it as soon as I try, and I will take it'.

(Ac) Action-cognition, vyavasāya, preparation, determination, initiation of effort 'the co-ordination, orientation or direction of the muscles and their movements'.

(Ad) Action-desire, yatna or kṛti, effort, endeavor, conation, 'the inception of movement in the muscles'.

(Aa) Action-proper, kriyā or karma, 'the seizing of the fruit'.

krama; they are vyaṭi-krama or disorder, which also is necessary however.

The endlessness of these four, as of the Āṭmā, is illustrated in all the multitudinous activities and relations of the world.

Pleasure and pain lie in the fulfilment and the defeat, respectively, of kāṅkṣhā. Both are summed up in ānanḍa. Pleasure corresponds

---

In the illustrative expressions belonging to the first six sub-divisions, the use of the word I, 'I see,' 'I want,' etc., should not be understood to indicate apperception, self-consciousness; it has been used only for concreteness and brevity.

The above are only samples of an endless complexity. Precise tabulation is nearly impossible, at least for some time to come. Only the general outlines of the 'scheme' are intended to be indicated. Such facts and experiences as are noted by modern psychologists (*Vide, e.g.*, W. James' *Principles of Psychology*, II, xxvi, pp. 522 *et-seq.*) under the names of 'kinesthetic sensation,' 'feeling of innervation,' 'fiat,' 'ideo-motor action,' 'muscular sense,' 'sensations of the movements of the joints of the body,' 'sensations of weight,' 'of temperature, external or internal,' 'of chills of fear at the heart,' 'heat of anger in the blood,' 'bowels of compassion,' 'tinglings, thrills, creeps, horripilation,' etc., should all be capable of reduction into such a scheme of sub-divisions proceeding by triplets.

to kāṅkṣhā and A; pain to ichchhā[1] and U; and ānanḍa, bliss, peace, the disappearance of both pleasure and pain, to kāmanā and M. The inner identity of nature of pleasure and pain, the fact that both are rooted in ānanḍa and both caused by kāmanā, may be realised through the fact that they are always changing place; what is pleasant at one time becomes painful at another, and what is painful at one time becomes pleasant at another.

All these three, pleasure, pain, and peace, are summed up in the AUM, the true name of Brahman, which, because of this fact, is always used at the beginning, the middle, and the end of all manṭras or sacred chants.

The other words, yaṭ, 'which,' ṭaṭ, 'that,' etc., used to denote Brahman, as, for instance, in the *Gāyaṭrī*, are so used only to indicate its tri-unity and all-inclusiveness (which is the characteristic of relative pronouns).

Sub-divisions appear again under each of the four, kāmanā, etc., thus: āshā, ḍurāsha, nirāṣhā, etc. Nirāṣhā, absence of hope, sums up āshā, good hope, and ḍurāshā,

---

[1] Obviously, ichchhā, here, corresponds to U only when treated as a sub-variety, distinguishable from the other sub-divisions and aspects, kāmanā, etc., of desire in general. When desire in general is spoken of, side by side with cognition or action, then it is made to correspond with M.

bad, evil, gloomy or dark, hope or despair. Hence the counsel that action should be performed with nirāṣhā, with no-hope, without hope of fruit or reward.

Saṅkalpa, planning, resolving, and vikalpa, hesitating, vacillating, alternating between two different courses, 'halting between two opinions,'—the two together being known as vikāra, transformation or change—appear in connexion with āshā (and ḍurāshā ?). The third, which connects together these two, is anukalpa. 'I do this, I shall do this'—such is the form of saṅkalpa. But in view of the arising of new or other possible causes, new or other possible circumstances, second thoughts arise, 'this should not be done by so-and-so, or I shall not do this (vikalpa), but, in place of this, this other is the proper thing to do (anukalpa.)' Because all time and all causes and all effects are not within any one individual's cognisance and power, therefore nothing can be said by any individual to be positively certain; and, consequently, an alternative resolution is also always kept before itself by a thoughtful jīva, 'if so-and-so happens, I shall not do this but do this other thing instead'—this is anukalpa.

In the *Veḍa*-logion Aham-bahu-syām, 'I-many-may-become,' Aham corresponds to saṅkalpa, bahu to vikalpa, and syām

to anukalpa. And as the three factors of the logion are one, so these three are also one.

Other correspondences, from different standpoints may be noted :—

A—saṅkalpa—kāmanā—syām
U—vikalpa——ichchhā—bahu
M—anukalpa—kāṅkṣhā—asmi

or

kāmanā—kāṅkṣha
kāṅkṣha—ichchhā
ichchhā—kāmanā

Abandoning saṅkalpa and vikalpa, the jīva becomes a yōgi and dwells constantly in anukalpa[1]. The yōgi is he who 'joins together all things into one,' who knows that all experiences come to all. The mukṭa is he who is 'delivered' from the belief, the heresy, of the separateness of the Three. The brāhmaṇa is he who knows Brahman.

The process of saṅkalpa-vikalpa-anukalpa makes up vichāra, thought, thinking, mind-'moving,' mind-'revolving.' The power that decides, that brings out nishchaya,

[1] 'Living in the present,' 'presence of mind,' 'enough for the day is the evil thereof,' 'whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might,' 'resourcefulness,' 'readiness for all happenings,' 'power of adjustment,' 'adaptability'—are the words which help to bring out the significance of the condition, from the empirical standpoint.

certainty, 'final choice,' from amidst these processes, is buḍḍhi, intelligence, intellect, or reason. Vichāra is the work or action of buḍḍhi, (aḍhyavasāya or nishchaya being the fruit of that action). Sanḍeha, doubt, corresponds to Samsāra, the World-process, manyness, and to vikalpa or vacillation. Nishchaya, certainty, decision or determination, corresponds to Āṭmā, the Self and the One, and to saṅkalpa or resolve. Siḍḍhānṭa or 'established truth' gathers and sums up both.

Vichāra, from another standpoint, subdivides into asmṛṭi, vismṛṭi and anusmṛṭi, non-remembrance, forgetting,[1] and expectation, respectively. Smṛṭi, recollection, is the significance or characterising essence of them all, that is to say, the nature of recollection defines the nature of the other mental processes.

The power or faculty of recollection is buḍḍhi, for only the certain, the decided and determined, facts are remembered. That which has been ascertained in all ways, as 'this is thus only'—the

[1] Vismṛṭi seems to be more like 'erroneous recollection' than mere negative 'forgetting' which would be only non-remembrance already separately mentioned. Also, from one standpoint, it would seem that smṛṭi, asmṛṭi, and vismṛṭi are the trinity of which the summation is anusmṛṭi.

holding of such an ascertained fact in the mind through all time, with the belief that other than it is not possible—such is the form or nature of memory. That which is uncertain and unnecessary[1] with respect to oneself, 'was it, is it, or could it be thus or not thus?'—such is the form of vismṛṭi, forgetting. The cause of vismṛṭi is bhrama, 'wandering,' inattention, delusion. The 'power' or faculty of vismṛṭi is therefore abuḍḍhi, non-intelligence, the nature of which is uncertainty. Anusmṛṭi comes out, arises by, or by means of a combination of smṛṭi and vismṛṭi. That which occurred in the past has been forgotten; that which belongs to to-day, the present time, is being remembered; what has occurred and occurs in past and present time will also occur in the future;—this set of facts and beliefs, permeated with hope, is the form or nature of anusmṛṭi, 'after-memory,' expectation. The power or faculty of anusmṛṭi is suḍhī, the good or discerning intellect. Vismṛṭi refers to past time, smṛṭi to present, and anusmṛṭi to future.

[1] The word 'unnecessary' seems to have a retrospective significance here; it is only what is not felt to be necessary and does not arouse interest and so arrest attention which is not strongly and accurately impressed on the memory.

Other correspondences may be noted as follows:—

A—Aṭmā—smṛṭi—praṭyakṣha—saṅkalpa—kāṅkṣhā.

U—Samsāra—anusmṛṭi—nirṅaya—anukalpa—āshā.

M—Niṣheḍha—vismṛṭi—anumāna—vikalpa—ichchhā.

Vichāra, thinking, is the saṭṭā, the being, of all three, and jñāna, cognition, knowledge, underlies and unifies them all.

Memory and expectation are, it is obvious, mutually dependent. Anusmṛṭi, (as association of ideas) expectation, even etymologically means 'that which follows memory,' smaraṇam anu. Memory too, conversely, depends on expectation (through the desire for results in the future which stimulates and strengthens memory; which, indeed, justifies the existence of memory and makes it useful and therefore possible and necessary). Some other aspects of this side of consciousness may be noted. Smaraṇa, recollection, refers to all-time (and belongs 'to the ideal'). Ḍhāraṇā, holding, holding in consciousness, is in essence the same thing as smaraṇa[1], (but belongs to the 'real').

[1] As with 'wish' and, 'desire,' so with 'memory' and 'recollection' or 'remembrance,' the meaning seems to have changed in the course of the development of the words from the roots. The root of

They may be distinguished thus: S m a r a ṇ a is the means; ḍ h ā r a ṇ ā is the accomplishment. S m a r a ṇ a is the action; ḍ h ā r a ṇ ā is the result thereof. 'That which is seen or heard or cognised *now* (in this particular time), *is* always (in all-time)' —such is the work of ḍ h ā r a ṇ ā. Because there is no real difference between *now* and *then* (both being aspects of the partless 'emptiness' called time) therefore all is everywhere and always.

'memory' and 's m ṛ ṭ i' is possibly the same, but s m ṛ ṭ i now has more the significance of recollection or act of remembrance from time to time, while ḍ h ṛ ṭ i implies persistency, or tenacity of holding in consciousness, the *power* of memory, or retentiveness. So 'desire' is now used with an implication of greater permanence and depth than 'wish,' and therefore is for practical purposes a better equivalent to i c h c h h ā than 'wish,' notwithstanding that the latter seems to be derived from the same root i ṣ h as i c h c h h ā. Another fact worth noting is that though some of the explanations given, in the text above, of k ā m a n ā, seem to mark it as the more comprehensive word and the fitter to take the middle place in the triple sub-division of consciousness recognised in this work, yet as a fact i c h c h h ā is given this place between j ñ ā n a and k r i y ā throughout the remaining sections of the book. Other allied meanings of ḍ h ṛ ṭ i are endurance, patience, self-possession, non-self-forgetfulness, etc.

Thus there is no real difference between ḍhṛṭi and smṛṭi, memory and recollection. Smaraṇa is a form of cognition; the safe 'placing' away of that which is obtained thereby is ḍhṛṭi.

The knowledge that is or lies between Āṭmā and Samsāra, that is to say, the knowledge of Samsāra from the point of view of Āṭmā and the knowledge of the Self from the point of view of the world—this is smṛṭi or smaraṇa. 'The world is'—this is the knowledge (of the world) by the Self. 'The Āṭmā is'—this is the knowledge of (the Self by) the world. The binding together of the two in the way or by the means of *is*—is smṛṭi. The connectedness, the conjointness, the condition of their being merged together, is ḍhṛṭi. Thus it is said that the world is *held* within the Self, and the Self *held* within the world. That the world never exists apart from the Self, and the Self never apart from the world—this is the nature (and consequence) of ḍhṛṭi. The standing together, the conjunctional condition, of things which have one common being, which are not in reality separate, but appear as separate—this is memory. Its nature, its form, is that of the mutual dependence and implication of all things whatsoever; everything contains all things whatsoever. Even in separateness, the two, the

Self and the Not-Self, are connected as 'other-and-other,' 'each-other,' parasparа; this reference to 'the other' exists inviolably and necessarily in each. Therefore the combination of the two (or, rather, the holding of the whole Not-Self in the Self by the Self) is memory (*i.e.*, is the fact or the principle which manifests in the consciousness of the individual jīva as memory).

Cognition, knowledge, is possible only by means of the senses, (that is to say, only when the Self has become identified with a limited organism), and only when two things (subject and object on the one hand, and the two factors of opposed pairs, ḍvanḍva, both factors falling under the term 'object,' on the other hand) come together[1].

The *succession* (of the moods, conscious states, psychoses) of the jīva is endless time. It is also

[1] This is a statement, in its fullest significance, of what is called in modern philosophy, the relativity of knowledge; also of the view that all knowledge begins in and is concerned about sensations in the proper sense of the term, *excepting* one knowledge, *viz.*, Self-Consciousness which includes all knowledge however. The debate about innate ideas, or the distinction between the 'matter' and the 'form' of knowledge, can never arise or is past for the student of this metaphysic.

the significance and constitution of memory, which too has therefore an endless stretch and extension. This endlessness, pseudo-infinity, is observable everywhere in the world, in time, action, speech, knowledge, etc. Each moment of time and each item of the others is connected with an endless series of other similar moments and items. We may notice memory within memory, and memory within that again, and so on, *ad infinitum*. We remember that we remembered; we hold that we held (such and such a view). We learn from the *Vedas* that there are smṛṭi-sṛṣhti and mānasa-sṛṣhti, 'worlds of memory' and 'worlds of mind or thought (or thought-forms)'. Mānasa-vichāra, 'mental-travel,' thinking, thought, is the thread of and through 'forgetfulness, memory, and expectation,' corresponding respectively to vikalpa, saṅkalpa, and anukalpa, doubt, resolve, and alternative resource.

We may consider a few illustrations: In the logion, Aham-bahu-syām, 'I—many—may-become,' the I is the Aṭmā, and the many is the Samsāra. The many in the I is memory. The I is mere oneness, and the memory of the many is necessary to it because of its relativity to the many. Without the memory of the many, the expression, 'may I become,' were impossible.

That such memory is existent everywhere (as sub-consciousness)[1] appears from the fact that this logion is embodied and illustrated in the life, for instance, of the vegetable kingdom also; the one plant becomes the many seeds.

Memory embodies all procession, all progress and evolution. Taking shape as an ideal to strive after, working in the way of the constant contemplation of the lives of the Great Ones, it leads on the small to become like the great. Indeed, memory may be said to be identical with the whole of the World-process itself, being immanent in the conjunction of Self and Not-Self, Āṭmā and Samsāra, Aham and Bahu.

We may distinguish between jñāna and smarāṇa or cognition and memory by saying that the second stage or condition or transformation

---

[1] The preceding remarks about the distinctions between smṛṭi and ḍhṛṭi, etc., may have appeared obscure. Their meaning will become plain as soon as the significance of the Logion, I—not-I—Not, is realised. And when the nature of *memory* is understood in the light of this Logion, then the theoretical difficulties which now perplex psycho-physicists and those engaged in psychical research as to how to explain sub- or supra- or subliminal or supraliminal consciousness and as to whether individuals are in touch with cosmic consciousness or not, etc., will vanish. See *The Science of Peace*, pp. 287-298.

of cognition is memory; jñāna precedes, smaraṇa succeeds. Jñāna belongs to all time, is beginningless and endless, in as much as it belongs to the present which includes past and future; while memory belongs to the successive, to succession, to the beginnings and endings in time. Jñāna as a whole belongs to all-time, *i.e.*, to time as a whole; but its parts equally necessarily belong to the parts and successions of time. These parts of jñāna or knowledge are named smṛṭi, recollection.[1]

Because memory is inseparably connected with time in its parts, *i.e.*, with beginnings and endings, therefore are there breaks of memory from birth

[1] The modern reader who has followed the devolopment, in recent times, of the doctrine of the *continuum* of consciousness, in such works as James Ward's *Psychology*, Stout's *Manual of Psychology*, James' *Principles of Psychology*, etc., will find it easier to grasp the sense of the compressed text here, and will, reciprocally, find a most illuminating light thrown on the problems and the details left unexplained, at the last crux, in those works, by the metaphysic of psychology as expounded here. James especially has the characteristic of leading, and most brilliantly, right up to and then abruptly stopping short of that last step, which would complete the 'circle' of knowledge, and put, on the whole discussion and thought, the 'new' complexion of an achieved unification under which all things appear 'renewed'.

to birth ordinarily. The exceptions that occur from time to time, the cases of yogīs, the cases of ḍivya-ḍṛṣhti, 'divine sight' or clairvoyance, of ṭri-kāla-jña-ṭā, 'knowledge of the three times, past, present, and future,' mean that what to the ordinary person would be a *series* of distinct periods, separate parts of time, and of memories, has become reduced into one time, one present, and one praṭyakṣha, direct and immediate cognition or intuition, to the seer. Ordinarily the 'present' signifies the time extending from the beginning to the finishing of some one act, one condition, one life-time; hence memory commonly ranges within one life-time only. Such succession, beginning and ending in time, past, present and future, is the only way, the *sine qua non*, of manifestation, of existence and non-existence. Apart from it there is neither 'is,' nor 'is not,' nor 'not is'. As said before smṛṭi refers to the present, vismṛṭi to the past and anusmṛṭi to the future.

Each one of this triplet of past, present and future is repeated endlessly within each of the others. Such pseudo-infinity is observable everywhere in the World-process, as noted before. We have succession within succession, time within time, form within form, work within work, alphabet within alphabet, name within name, universe within universe, all within all, and Brahman within Brahman.

But while this pseudo-infinity of details within details corresponds to the infinity of the Universal Consciousness, each individual consciousness deals with and comprehends only a limited portion of the details. Hence we have the fact that what is called the omniscience of Brahmā and other high Gods signifies only that their 'memories' co-extend with vast but always limited cycles and circles of time and space and motion.

Memory is the basis of all reasoning, inference, argument, anumāna and nirṇaya, induction and deduction. Praṭyakṣha, direct cognition, is also used and summed up within it. The more comprehensive the memory, the stronger and more decided the other intellectual processes. Every jīva is potentially omniscient[1].

But we cannot say that because the jīva possesses omniscience potentially therefore it

[1] The difference between jīva and jīva is due to the difference in the *order* of the events, or experiences. If this order or succession, a mere emptiness, is abolished, only the collective total of experiences remains and 'all' jīvas merge into One, and worlds go into pralaya. Thus we see that the mere order of the contents of memory is the foundation of separate individuality and is at every moment of our existence that which distinguishes us from one another. (*Yōga-Sūṭra*, IV. 14 and *The Science of Peace*, p. 319).

4

possesses distinct memory through and of all time actually, for the word 'all' is, strictly, transcendental. Ordinarily, it means *the whole of some one series* only, for it is not independent of succession. Hence, memory, forgetting and expectation, appear even in those that are called omniscient. Omniscience, we see then, is also relative and comparative, and means, successively, with reference to the stages of the evolutionary growth of jīvas, 'full knowledge of the contents of a yuga, a mahā-yuga, a kalpa, a mahā-kalpa, a manvanṭara, a mahā-manvanṭara, etc'. Hence yogīs too cannot be said to possess full comprehension of the complete details of the *transcendental* 'all,' but only of the relative or comparative 'all' included in some one principal cycle.[1]

[1] Speaking of yogīs and brāhmaṇas, etc., as the holders of such knowledge, the author branches off here into a 'metaphysical' interpretation of the *Veḍa*-text which is regarded as the foundation of the caste-system of India. The interpretation may be gathered here in a foot-note because of its interest, and as a specimen of the thought of the author. 'The brāhmaṇa was Its mouth'—the mouth of Brahman means jñāna, knowledge; from and by knowledge only the brāhmaṇa was born, lives and shall live, always. 'The rājanya was made the arms'—the rājanya or kshaṭṭriya is he who is steadfast in the practice of rāja-yoga, the royal

This ā n ṭ a r y a, [1] 'relativity,' 'similarity in diversity,' extends everywhere. Like other greatness and smallness, great knowledge and

---

or highest form of y o g a ; b ā h u, (which is commonly explained as the arm, in accordance with current Samskṛṭ grammar) is S a m s ā r a, the World-process ; he is the maker of S a m s ā r a by means of the resolve 'May I become b a h u or many'. By the use of the word b a h u, (transformed by some rule of archaic Samskṛṭ grammar into b ā h u) it is meant that all the world has separately the right to j ñ ā n a, knowledge. 'The v a i s h y a came from the knee'—j ā n u (ordinarily meaning the knee but probably connected in archaic Samskṛṭ with j ñ ā, to know, in some way) means the extent of memory; 'j ā n u is used for s m a r a ṇ a'. V a i s h y a signifies the bringing of the senses into v a s h a or control. 'The s h ū ḍ r a was born from the feet'—p ā ḍ a, foot, refers to service. The realisation of all beings as the Self and consequent service of all—such is the characteristic of the s h ū ḍ r a. All these refer to the knowledge of B r a h m a n. Such is the author's metaphysical reduction of the four castes into different stages in the growth of the same j ī v a, showing its gradual growth in B r a h m a n-realisation, the stages being named by the names of the castes, but in an order the inverse of that currently given to them, the s h ū ḍ r a standing for the stage of highest self-sacrifice and therefore the most practical realisation of the Self.

[1] The modern Samskṛṭ equivalent is s ā p e k ṣ h y a.

small knowledge are also always comparative only. Strictly, the whole of knowledge, the whole of Samsāra, exists within each thousand-thousandth of each atom.[1] The uḍḍharaṇa, 'up-taking,' 'recovery' of any particular item out of this potential all-knowledge is memory.

In one sense memory may be said to be a form of a-bhāva or non-being, because it has no immediate outwardly existing object; but it is not pure non-being, it is a latent condition or mode of jñāna and has always a beginning and an end as only things existent have. And beginning and end are always relative to and inseparably connected with each other; what has a beginning has an end, and *vice versa*; so too, what is beginningless is endless, and *vice versa*. It is true that there is a current belief that a-bhāva, non-being, had no beginning but has an end. But on scrutiny, it appears that being and non-being are called 'endless' only with respect to one aspect of each, that 'being' underlies both being and non-being, that that saṭṭā, 'being,' in both is one and the same, and that only that

[1] Taken together with the important distinction pointed above between the transcendental all and the comparative all, this sentence seems to throw much light on the significance and value of processes of meditation, the steadying of the chiṭṭa-atom and so enabling it to reflect the all instead of a few (*Yoga-sūṭra*, I. 32, III. 33, 54, etc.)

which *is* can become *is not*. A-bhāva, non-being, implies that *nothing*, i. e., *nothing* as itself a fact, *is*. Negation, indeed, is the Shakṭi, the Energy, of Brahman. Thus, strictly, both being and nothing are beginningless and endless, and they are immanent in each other.

(The meaning of the above may perhaps be made more clear and concrete in this fashion. A-bhāva, non-being, *pure and simple*, if it has no beginning has no end either. What *has* an end is the a-bhāva, the non-existence, of *some particular thing*. This tree, this house, this town, *was not*, and now *is*. But as soon as we speak of some one particular thing as being non-existent at any particular time, we necessarily postulate the *possible* existence of that thing in a preceding time. The thing is *first present in our consciousness*, and we notice *its* non-existence in any particular space and time in the *second* moment. The negation of a thing assumes significance, acquires meaning, *after* and not before the *affirmation*, even though as a mere possibility, of that thing. *Undefined* negation, if beginningless, is also endless. *Defined* negation, negation defined, demarcated, specialised, by and of any thing, the non-existence of some one particular thing, is neither beginningless nor endless. It had a beginning, for our consciousness —and the specialisation or definition has no significance at all apart from 'our consciousness'—

the moment *after* the special thing came into our consciousness; it began when, after having postulated the thing of which it is predicated in one moment, in the next moment we *noticed its* non-existence. Thus then, there is an indefeasible relativity and connexion between 'being' and 'non-being' or 'nothing' and between 'existence' and 'non-existence'. When we say that non-being is beginningless we mean that no being or nothing ever was, or, in other words, that 'all' was not; and if this is true then it is also true that no being or nothing ever will be, or, in other words, that 'all' will never be. But if we say 'non-existence,' *i. e.*, the non-existence of this particular thing, has an end, then it is also true that the non-existence of this particular thing had a beginning also. This is so true indeed, that we have *the fact* embodied in such proverbs as that 'there is nothing new under the sun,' but that there are only repetitions and recurrences. And this is not surprising, for, by metaphysic, fact and consciousness mean the same thing.[1])

So the arising and disappearing of memory are also mutually related by means of the

[1] The above discussion has a special bearing on the practical question whether m o k ṣ h a or m u k ṭ i or n i r v ā ṇ a, once attained, lasts ever and ever, *i. e.*, for the rest of all time, or not. The current view, as held by all the 'believing' schools of Indian

common element of cognition, even as being and nothing are mutually immanent in the

---

philosophy to-day, is that *banḍhana*, bondage, or *aviḍyā*, nescience, has no beginning but has an end; and that, conversely, *mukṭi*, liberation, has a beginning but has no end. Loss of the true metaphysic, confusion as to the real nature of liberation and the wish to avoid the troubles of return from freedom into bondage—these are the parents of this current and illogical view which really does not carry conviction even to the professors of it. To the metaphysic expounded in this work it is clear and unobjectionable and indeed perfectly satisfactory that the freedom which has a beginning should have and has an end again in bondage also, while the freedom that has no end has no beginning either. See the last section of the work for unmistakeable statements on this point.

Note:—Psychological observations occur all over the work naturally in view of the fact that the triplet of cognition, desire and action is almost the foundation of its system, its importance therein being second only to that of the ultimate triplet of Self, Not-Self and Negation which is the deepest and most essential ground-work. Yet the bulk of the psychology of the work, in the modern sense of the term, may be said to be gathered in this section. Nowhere else in the course of the work is there such a connected discussion of psychological topics except

all inclusive Brahman, best named by the all comprehending AUM, the contents of which

---

in two other places towards the close of the third section where the emotions and again the nature of manas and buḍḍhi, etc., are discussed. It has been already remarked in a previous foot-note that different races and sub-races perceive different aspects of the same facts; and this is very noticeable in the sub-topics treated here. The sub-topics that are familiar in modern western works of psychology are not to be readily found here in the identical form. The main topics, cognition, desire and action, are also somewhat different from the modern tripartite division of intellect, feeling and will; that the former is the really accurate and much the more valuable classification will be obvious to the reader who goes through the whole work. The syllabus printed in the article on Psychology in Baldwin's *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, may be also cited as showing the tendency of western psychologists to travel in the direction of the older classification. For a discussion of the subject the reader may be referred to *The Science of the Emotions*, CH. iii., *The Science of Peace*, CH. ix., and an article entitled "Pure Verbalism" published in *The Theosophical Review* for April 1905. As to such sub-topics as sensation, perception, conception, attention, apperception, selection, comparison, association of ideas, imagination, judgment, belief, constructiveness, instinct, impulse, ethics, æsthetics, etc., etc., to say not thing of the topics newly created by the development-

are expounded in the *Veḍas* with their *Aṅgas* and *Upāṅgas*.

---

of psycho-physics—these are not treated of in this work in their exact modern sense. The reason is, in the first place, of course, the fact that the work does not profess to be an exhaustive one on psychology, but only an outline of metaphysic, and in the second place, the difference of standpoint of the author. At the same time, it must be obvious to the careful student that the *sources* of all these sub-topics *are* touched upon in the book, and that if the successive classification and continuous sub-division by triplets were carried out to any length, all the shades and aspects or modes and 'faculties' of consciousness or mind that have been caught by modern psychology would find their due places in that scheme with much other valuable material besides. Facts and indications of psycho-physics will be found here also, later on, not in the way of inchoate and unconscious suggestions, but of statements of developed results of investigation as to the connexion of nerve-ganglia with mental processes, 'the localisation of functions,' and the formation of living organisms by and out of atoms; only unfortunately the statements are far too few and therefore help but to tantalise. It is more than likely that the works on *Yoga* in that literature to which the *Praṇava-vāḍa* belongs, would, if brought to light, be found to contain more information on this subject of psycho-physics.

SECTION III.

Kriyā—ACTION.

CHAPTER I.

THE RELATION OF ACTION TO KNOWLEDGE *i.e.* THE VEḌAS.

Action as the fruit of cognition and desire.—Right action possible only after right knowledge and right desire, *i. e.*, after mastery of the four *Veḍas*, *Ṛk*, *Yajuh*, *Sāma*, and *Aṭharva*, corresponding to cognition, desire, action and their summation, respectively.—The fourfold sub-division of each *Veḍa*, into *Manṭra*, *Brāhmaṇa*, *Upaniṣhaṭ* and *Ṭanṭra*, by the same correspondence.—The study of all the four *Veḍas* neccessary for perfect accomplishment of the four stages of life and the achievement of m o k ṣ h a.—The fourfold path to m o k ṣ h a.—The four ā s h r a m a s, governed by the same correspondence.—Their inner significance.

The brief exposition of the nature of i c h c h ā or desire, and j ñ ā n a or cognition, in the previous section was a partial exposition of the constitution of the *Praṇava*. The fruit, the result, of that constitution is k r i y ā or action, to be explained now. (It should be remembered, however that this description of action as the fruit of the constitution of the *Praṇava* does not mean

that it falls outside that constitution. The fruit is also within it as the last and completing constituent.)

The triplet of j ñ ā n a, i c h c h h ā and k r i y ā, cognition, desire and action, is all included in the *Praṇava*, the AUM. J ñ ā n a is Ā ṭ m ā, the Self; i c h c h h ā, the expression of the Negation[1];

[1] This statement, *viz.*, that desire corresponds to Negation, is, at first sight, apt to be very puzzling; desire seems to be something so positive, indeed the root of all positive action. The full significance of the statement will unravel in the course of the book itself, naturally, especially in the chapter on the *Sāma-Veḍa*. But, in the meanwhile, it may perhaps be helpful to point out that negation hides affirmation within it. The closing paragraphs of the last chapter have an important bearing on this point. When the World-process is summed up in the words 'I-This-Not,' it is described as the eternal and changeless realisation of the Self by Itself in one single act of consciousness, as being 'nothing else than Itself'. In this act of consciousness, the 'else' is denied, negated, is declared to be nothing, but even in the moment of so denying it a false possibility of existence, a pseudo-existence, is given to it, is affirmed of it. Hence Negation becomes the S h a k ṭ i, the Energy, of *affirmation*-negation in the successive procession of the world, from the standpoint of the limited 'else'. And this is the very nature and essence of desire; it affirms and denies; it craves and suffers surfeit; it loves and

while kriyā, the modifications or operations of consciousness which appear as doings, actions, movements, should be regarded as equivalent to the whole of Samsāra, the World-process. All manifestation takes place only when the actor projects action.

These three, together with the fourth which is their summation, their unity, make the 'four noble truths' of Brahman. All these four are declared to be Brahman. The four

---

hates; it is desire and aversion. Because the aspect of it, which is dominant or uppermost, which is so to say final, is the negative one, because in the Logion and in actual world-fact, Negation is the real relation of the Self to the Not-Self, therefore, in this book, desire is said everywhere to correspond to and to be of the nature of Negation. The discussion of the value of Negation or the negative is perennial in modern logic; though the standpoint is very different yet still if the reader has followed it in any good treatise, *e.g.*, Sigwart's *Logic*, Vol I., ch. iv., and has revolved in mind all the bearings of Spinoza's celebrated saying, 'omnis determinatio est negatio,' he will have prepared his way to the very comprehensive significance given to the Negation here. The continual freshness of the subject is illustrated, for instance, by such a recent article as that on "Contradiction and Reality" by Bernard Bosanquet in *Mind* for January, 1906. For a fuller discussion of the nature of the Negation see *The Science of Peace*, CHS. xi-xii.

Veḍas are these four truths. The *Ṛg-Veḍa* is devoted to cognition; the *Yajur-Veḍa* to action; the *Sāma-Veḍa* to desire; the seed and the unity of these is the subject of the *Aṭharva-Veḍa*. Each of the *Veḍas*, again, is sub-divided in accordance with this trinity into: the *Manṭra*, connected with cognition; the *Brāhmaṇa*, with action; the *Upanishaṭ*, with desire; and, finally, the *Ṭanṭra*, also called the *Upa-veḍa*, which is the seed and unity, the summation, of these. Each of these four, *Manṭra*, etc., is further sub-divided fourfold, and so on endlessly. The *Manṭra* part is also called the *Samhiṭā*. That which 'brings together' all things is *Samhiṭā*. 'Knows,' hence *Veḍa* (from the root viḍ, to know). *Veḍa* is knowledge connected with Brahman and hence of all things whatsoever. Therefore is the *Veḍa* said to be the manifest form of Brahman. Therefore too is it said that the knower of the *Veḍa* becometh Brahman. That whereby is known, ṛkṣhaṭē, the ṭaṭṭva, the essential truth, of Brahman is the *Ṛg-Veḍa-Samhiṭā*. That whereby is made, brought about, in sacrifices, yajaṭē, the manifestation of that ṭaṭṭva, is the *Yajur-Veḍa-Samhiṭā*. That whereby are balanced sāmyaṭē, brought together, connected, by desire, the other two, *viz.*, cognition and action, that is the *Sāma-Veḍa-Samhiṭā*. That whereby the fruit of these three is obtained,

aryaṭe, is the *Aṭharva-Veḍa-Samhiṭā.*[1] The purpose of these four *Samhiṭā*-parts is the setting forth of all knowledge about cognition, action, desire and their fruit.

---

[1] These derivations are archaic and only partly recognised by modern Samskṛṭ grammar. In current Samskṛṭ, ṛch means to eulogise, and ṛchchh, to 'reach,' to go, to obtain, to faint, to enter into trance, to take shape (anew), to command, etc. Yaj is to offer up, to sacrifice. Sāma to conciliate, to harmonise. Aṭharva is variously derived; a+ṭhurva, to 'not injure' (to negate the corruption of the primal purity of the Self); or aṭha=arṭha, to pray, to intend, to will,+ṛ, to move or ṛchchh, *i.e.*, to work by will, etc. By current tradition the *Aṭharva-Veḍa* is regarded as the reverse of what the derivation would imply, *viz.* as 'impure,' 'injurious,' etc. The reason may be that because it was the completion and the highest of the *Veḍas*, and imparted knowledge which would be the most 'dangerous,' if it fell into evil hands and was misused, therefore it was enveloped in such a tradition, and guarded like the secrets of the army and navy departments of modern governments. The special form that was given to the tradition might be due to the psychological condition—like that of grown-up children—of earlier humanity. The etymology of the name of Vishvāmiṭṭra, the seer of the *Gāyaṭrī* is similar. Apparently the word means 'the non-friend of the world'; really 'the great friend of it'.

By *Ṛk, Yajuh, Sāma* and *Aṭharva,* all four together, is Brahman to be obtained. Each singly is useless. Not by knowledge alone is Brahman found; nor by action alone; nor by desire alone. Fourfold is the truth of Brahman. Cognition, desire and action are all equally neccessary means to mokṣha, liberation, deliverance from pain and sorrow and limitations. All and each is dependent on and supported by all and each. This is what is meant by statements like this, *viz.,* 'By the knowledge of a single atom may knowledge of Brahman be obtained.' From the point of view of relativity all are small and all are great. Each atom is Brahman, because cognition, desire and action are present everywhere and in each atom. To see and hear and fully know one atom is therefore to know Brahman.[1] But by such *knowledge* alone the transcendental state of Brahman is not wholly attained.

[1] Compare Tennyson's pretty little poetical address to the "Flower in the crannied wall". It is well recognised at the present day that *complete* knowledge about any one thing implies literal omniscience; but the reason for this is supposed to be that everything is connected in some way or other with everything else. But in this work, and in the scheme of metaphysic it propounds, the *additional* reason is given that everything also *contains* everything else.

For Brahman is the transcendental and infinite totality of all things, great and small, (and such mere knowledge can therefore amount to only a third of Brahman, and not to a full realisation of the whole of It); for that full realisation of It which is meant by moksha, all three, knowledge, desire and action, are necessary. He who has the power of knowledge, of desire and of action, he alone is the knower of *Veḍa*, he is the finder, winner and possessor of Brahman.

Hence the unavoidable necessity of studying *all* the four *Veḍas*.

After completing the study of all the *Veḍas*, and finishing the stage of brahmacharya or celibate studentship, the human being should enter on the life of the gṛhasṭha or householder. The rule is that the household should be undertaken only after completing brahmacharya (which means, literally, the *practice* or the pursuit of Brahman). Unperfected in the practice of Brahman the man may not enter the household life. Till he knows the whole truth of Brahman, the whole of the *Veḍa*, he cannot perform rightly the work of the world in the shape of the householder's life.[1] Triple is the work of the world—

[1] In modern days, Kingsley has urged that men should pass a certain examination before being permitted to take up the married life. It is

cognition, and desire, and action based on these two. Where all this triplet appears in due and balanced exercise, that is the genuine household life. So long, therefore, as the man does not know the whole secret of this triplet and of their mutual connexion and summation, so long is he unworthy to take up the work of the household. After g ā r h a s ṭ h y a, the household life, comes v ā n a p r a s ṭ h a, the forest life, and finally s a n n y ā s a, the life of renunciation.

In the course of the household life all actions should be performed, in accordance with the law of necessity, even as B r a h m a n carries on the whole work of S a m s ā r a within Itself. In that life there should be no such ideas entertained of illusive separateness as that 'this is thine,' 'this is mine,' 'he is mine,' 'this is another's,' etc. The welcoming of all and the accomplishment of everything, by means of cognition, desire and action,—such is the high duty of the householder. For charity, for self-sacrifice, and for the perfecting of the B r a h-man-state within oneself, is the householder's life to be undertaken. The fruit and moral of all the study of all the *Vedas* is but this: Cast

interesting, in this connexion, to note how completely this theory and practice of life would solve the matrimonial questions now vexing the western world. (Note sent by Mr. E. H. Bellairs.) We may very well add, 'and the eastern,' at this day.

out the s v ā r ṭ h a, the self-seeking, the selfishness, that is ingrained in the heart of every individual organism; also pass beyond p a r ā r t h a, the other-seeking or altruism that also harbours, though in a different way, the sense of otherness and separateness; perform only the p a r a-m ā r ṭ h a, the highest end, *necessary* duty.[1] Egoism and altruism both belong to b a n-ḍ h a n a, bondage; p a r a m ā r ṭ h a, duty, alone is the true refuge of all who crave m o k ṣ h a, freedom. Having accomplished b r a h m a-c h a r y a and known the eternal B r a h m a n, having understood all this world, above and below, high and low, to be triple in nature, and

[1] A fundamental difference between eastern and western ethics may be noted here, as due to the different views of the divine nature severally entertained. The western view of God as extra-cosmic, as apart from His world, leaves each spirit as eternally separate from every other spirit; hence there are always 'others,' and love to, and service of, all these others, altruism, is the highest conceivable ideal. The eastern view of God as inter-cosmic, informing, immanent in, His world, makes each spirit identical in essence with 'Himself' and with all others; hence, when all is truly seen, there are no 'others,' but only one all-pervading Self; altruism vanishes as well as egoism, and the living of the One Self in all its parts, the performance of necessary action, is the 'highest end'. (A. B.)

then having donned the household life, let the man serve all the world with all his power as his set duty. Guests, casual comers, worthy brahmacharīs, yaṭīs, hermits of pure ways, sannyāsīs who have renounced the worldly life, forest-dwellers, and other householders too, should be supported by him with all his resources. They should all be welcomed and honored by the householder who has attained to the state of Brahman, who is mukṭa, who is established in the supreme peace that is the heart of Brahman. This is the only worthy āshrama, this is the refuge, the resting-place and support, of all beings. Brāhmaṇas, yogīs, great-souled jīvan-mukṭas, Mahā-Vishṇu himself, the ruler of our world-system, all are householders bearing assiduously the burden of the world, ever engaged in all duties, yet ever free from all karma, self-established, equable-souled, ever beholding themselves as the One Self in all things.[1]

---

[1] This is the ideal aristocracy where the lords and nobles, as representing the divine monarchy, live only to turn the wheel of Duty, '*noblesse oblige*.' It is the ideal democracy also, for the essential and ultimate equality of all jīvas and the necessity of each working for all according to his qualifications is also perfectly recognised and insisted on herein.

The word ā s h r a m a means 'that wherein people rest, or are rested on,' ā s h r i y a n ṭ ē a s m i n. Because of this, and because of cognition, desire, action, and their mutual relation (being the four 'resting-places' or aspects of consciousness which are the essence and the whole of life), these four stages are called ā s h r a m a s. Studentship is related to cognition, the household-life to action, the forest-stage to desire; renunciation is the summation.[1]

The duties of all these ā s h r a m a s should be discharged perfectly by man; and they cannot be so discharged without mastery of all the four *Vedas*. Hence the reiterated injunction that they should be studied in their totality in the first stage. In the household, the feeling of selfishness, m a m a-ṭ ā, 'mineness,' is transcended gradually. The object that is at first exclusively appropriated to the use of oneself, becomes, in consequence of the espousal of a wife, appropriated to that of two; and yet again, when children appear, to that of three, four, five, and so on. Thus gradually the man comes to realise the whole world as himself; and this, because, in fact, all are one. He who has seen

[1] From another standpoint the four stages may be classed into two groups, the first two (as preparation and accomplishment) making up the p r a v r̥ ṭ ṭ i half of life, and the second two (again as preparation and achievement) of the n i v r̥ ṭ ṭ i half.

and known Brahman during brahmacharya, he, because of that fact, feels a family relationship and an equal mood of love towards all beings, and acts accordingly. Having discharged the duties of the household the man passes into the forest-life, of the nature of desire. The consciousness belonging to that stage is this: Whatever I have done, or am doing, or shall do, is all necessary and not dependent on any capricious will of mine, thine, or another's. This is the natural result of the Negation which corresponds to desire and the forest-life. In sannyāsa even this disappears. That wherein all previous karma is 'well destroyed,' samyak nasyaṭi[1], is sannyāsa. The consciousness belonging to this stage is: There is no necessity and no contingency; nothing belongs to others or to us, to all or to any one; whatever is, is the Trinity only. Acquisition of knowledge in brahmacharya; practice thereof in gārhasṭhya; certainty in vānaprasṭha; realisation

[1] The etymologies reproduced in this summary are all taken from the original text, *verbatim*, thus, the word in the text is nasyaṭi and not nashyaṭi nor nyasyaṭi; they are not all in accordance with modern Samskṛṭ grammar and should be assumed to be archaic. Paṇdiṭ Ḍhanarāja maintained that they are all perfectly justified by the older and truer and far more comprehensive grammar.

in sannyāsa—such is the distinction between them,

But, verily, there is no difference
Of student, and of dweller in the house,
And anchorite, and roamer of the earth.
The Self hath neither caste, nor staged life.
Nor brāhmaṇa am I, nor kṣhaṭṭriya,
Nor am I vaishya, and not shūḍra too,
Not student, and not honored patriarch,
Nor forest eremite, nor wanderor
Without possessions or in heaven or earth,
I own and owe no duties and no rights,
I am what these subserve as humble means,
I am the Free, through and from all these bonds,
I am the Self, Self-Conscious Formlessness.
And all this panorama of the world,
Broad-spread and ever-moving, seemingly,
Is but one vast rock-bound necessity [1],
Is very Brahman, Being-Wisdom-Bliss
One changeless whole, Tri-unity of AUM.

---

[1] See *The science of Peace*, pp. 138, *et seq* .

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

Chapter II.

THE GENESIS OF THE VEḌAS.

The authors of the *Veḍas.*—The rulers of the worlds.—The world-systems and cycles which they rule.

The World-process works by means of hierarchies of rulers, endlessly graded as subordinates and overlords, all classified by functions under cognition, desire, action and summation, and dealing with definite cycles and extents of space and time, *i. e.*, world-systems, on all scales, ever minuter and ever vaster. Each world-system has a Brahmā, a Viṣhṇu and a Shiva, the three being subordinate to a Mahā-Viṣhṇu.[1]

Mahā-Viṣhṇu ideates, places before himself, the *Aṭharva Veḍa*, and deals with the summation; Viṣhṇu, the *Ṛg-Veḍa* and cognition; Brahmā, the *Yajur-Veḍa* and action; and Shiva, the *Sāma* and desire.

---

[1] It would probably be correct to add at the end of this sentence, 'in our world-system'. It seems likely that in other world-systems, a Mahā-Shiva or a Mahā-Brahmā is the overlord, according to the predominance of the element of desire or of action in the system. This is hinted in the work elsewhere.

That whereinto all enter, vishanṭi, is Viṣhṇu; he who covers up, vriṇīṭē, envelopes, surrounds, undertakes all, is Brahmā; he who sleeps, sheṭē, in everything, is Shiva. Shiva sleeps, lies hidden, in all and everything as the nexus, the bond, and this is the nature of desire. Vriṇīṭē signifies the envelopment, the covering with an envelope, the demarcation of the limiting bounds or the periphery, and so the formation or creation (of all forms); and this is action presided over by Brahmā. Vishanṭi sarvāṇi indicates that all things enter into It and It into all, and such is the Self, connected with cognition and Viṣhṇu. The summation or totality of these is Mahā-Viṣhṇu.

Mahā-Viṣhṇu, 'the overlord of all this world-system, is described as the Īshvara, white-colored, four-armed, adorned with the conch, the discus, the mace, the lotus, the forest-wreath, and the kaustubha-gem, shining, vestured in blue and yellow, endless and imperishable in form, attributeless yet ensouling and underlying all attributes.[1] Here, the epithet Īshvara indicates the ruler; the four arms, the four activities of

[1] Such parts of the description here as in strictness belong only to the impersonal Brahman, *e.g.*, "attributeless,...*all* sound,...*all* time,...the *whole* of that procession...etc.," are to be understood to apply to Mahā-Viṣhṇu only in a comparative sense, *i.e.*, within the limits of his own body, world-system, 'Ring-pass-not,' or periphery.

cognition, etc.; the white resplendence is the illumination of all things; the shaṅkha, conch or shell, indicates all sound, and the chakra, wheel or discus, all time, there being a connexion between the two; gaḍā, the (whirling) mace, is the spiral method of the procession of the world and the lotus-flower is the whole of that procession; the vana-mālā, the wreath of forest flowers, indicates the stringing together of all things into unity and necessity; the nīla-pīṭ-āmbara, blue and yellow vestures, are darkness and light; the kausṭubha jewel indicates inseparable connexion with all; nirguṇa, attributeless, shows the presence of the nature of Negation; while saguṇa, attributeful, implies possession of name and form.[1]

The World-process (as embodied in our world-system) is the result of the ideation of Mahā-

[1] The reasons for these attributions of symbols may be a little further explained. Sound is creative—and destructive; forms are built up by sound, and it has been shown by many experiments that shell-forms are among the most frequent creations of musical notes; for these reasons, as well as for the very powerful and peculiar vibrations caused by blowing into it, the conch has been selected as the symbol of creative activity by sound. The chakra or whirling disc is the svasṭikā, the cross of fire, which, in rapid rotation, has each arm blown backwards; it is found everywhere in

Vishṇu. This ideation of the methods, laws, principles or outlines of that World-process is the *Veḍa,* (as 'I am this and this and this, and not this and this and this' etc). It is true that the ideation is the Samsāra, the World-process, and that there is no difference between the two, *i.e.,* between ideation as *Veḍa* and ideation as Samsāra; but all manifestation and description of the successive implies the principle of beginnings and ends, and that implies

---

the world, also as a symbol of creative fire, the 'electric cross,' or wheel. As the conch symbolises creation in space, so is the svastikā creation in time, the whirling arms signifying succession. The mace is often given as the sign of rule, held by the ruler of the world-system, the sceptre which directs and if necessary, punishes. The lotus-flower is the symbol of a universe, and this owing to the fact that our universe, *i.e.,* our solar system, when seen from a higher plane, looks like an expanded flower of that kind. All wreaths symbolise the threading of the many on the One. "All this is threaded on me as pearls on a string." The blue vesture symbolises the blue of space, which is, in truth, darkness, and the yellow, the golden rays of the sun, the source of light. The kaustubha-gem is the 'Jewel in the Lotus,' the Self in the Universe, and hence ever adorns the breast of Him in whom the I and the This are united, the Īshvara of a universe. (A.B.)

separateness between description and described, thought and thing. (Thought and thing are one only from the standpoint of the absolute Brahman, wherein the whole World-process is summed up in a single act of consciousness; in the successive, on the other hand, they become two; the ideation of a definite portion, treated as *a whole*, becomes an *inner* and ever-complete *potential*; and the *parts* of this, an *outer* and successive *actual*.)[1] Otherwise, indeed, the World-process *is* Brahman and that is All-Consciousness, All-Ideation.

From Mahā-Vishṇu arise in succession, Vishṇu, Brahmā and Shiva, cognition, action and desire, and each receives from him the *Veḍa, i.e.,* the statute, the body of rules, suited to his own department of work, *viz., Ṛk, Yajuh* and *Sāma,* respectively, the totality being the *Aṭharva.* This order is only actual (to our world-system) and not essential. Each of the three gods knows all the *Veḍas,* because of their mutual relation, their unity, in fact. Brahmā, no doubt, is said to be the Karṭā, the actor or maker, of the *Veḍas.* But this means only that he is the *active* promulgator and teacher of the *Veḍas* (to the world that he makes or creates). He is inseparably connected with all action.

[1] For fuller discussion of this distinction between ideal and real see *The Science of Peace*, pp. 283-284.

Whatever appears or is seen or heard or learnt—all that is action; and Brahmā must be regarded as the *actor* of it all.

As is declared,[1] Brahmā, gave, that is, taught, the *Veḍas* to his eldest son Aṭharva. Aṭharva here signifies the summation, the totality, of the jīvas that Brahmā has to deal with. It is also said, in further detail, that Brahmā spoke the *Veḍas* to Bṛhaspaṭi; he to Inḍra; he to Bharaḍvāja; he to the ṛṣhis; and they to the brāhmaṇas, etc. Here, Bṛhaspaṭi indicates a certain class of jīvas, and Inḍra is an office-bearer also concerned with action. The declaration of the *Veḍas* thus passed downwards in succession through the various hierarchies, for the instruction and benefit of all creation.[2]

---

[1] In the *Muṅḍaka-Upaniṣhaṭ*.

[2] According to recognised Hinḍū tradition, the present fourfold division is due to Vyāsa, who said that the then coming race of men would not be able to receive the whole knowledge, as conveyed in the single *Veḍa*, and hence divided it into four. It may be remarked that similarly, the four castes are due to the incapacity of humanity to unfold itself symmetrically, balanced in each direction; hence it became necessary to practise one set or class of virtues at a time, and to allocate one set to one caste, causing for the time an unequal, lop-sided evolution, to be subsequently balanced up in the perfect Yogī, who belongs to no caste, but manifests the virtues of all. (A.B.)

It is true that the world extends endlessly beyond Mahā-Vishṇu also, but we, as limited individuals, can deal with only limited details. We have no words for matters beyond Mahā-Vishṇu. The *Mahā-Veḍa*, which is known only to Mahā-Vishṇu and the three gods immediately next in degree deals with such matters. Our knowledge, *i.e.*, the knowledge of j ī v a s belonging to our particular world-system, can range only within the limits of these *Veḍas*, from an atom (in size) and a thousandth of a ṭ r u ṭ i (in time) to Mahā-Vishṇu.

The various cycles that our gods and we are concerned with may be briefly mentioned here. Knowledge of cycles brings knowledge of the reason of those statements in the *Veḍas* which deal with time, as the *Praṇava*-logion deals with the Timeless that includes all time. As the time-measures from the ṭ r u ṭ i up to the y u g a are matter of common knowledge, we shall begin here with the y u g a, taking our ordinary human years for this measurement. It is true that all months and years belong to all, (*i.e.*, any system of years and months can be used to measure the course of any system of events); but this depends upon the knowledge (of the measurer being sufficiently comprehensive to include both the sets of systems concerned, in their proper mutual proportion and co-ordination in a

larger system)[1]; otherwise the year of one jīva is the month of another, and *vice versa*, this being entirely a relative matter.

The kṛṭa-yuga or saḍ-yuga, concerned with cognition, covers 1,736,000 years; the ṭreṭā, dealing with action, extends over 1,245,000[2]; 864,000 years make the ḍvāpara, devoted to desire; kali, with 432,000 years, is the summation of all.

One set of these four	= 1 chaṭur-yuga.
1000 chaṭur-yuga-s	= 1 viyuga.
1000 viyuga-s	= 1 mahā-yuga.
1000 maha-yuga-s	= 1 kalpa.
7 kalpa-s	= 1 mahā-kalpa.
14 mahā-kalpa-s	= 1 chakra.
14 chakra-s	= 1 niṣhtha.
14 niṣhtha-s	= 1 manu.
(2 manu-s	= 1 manvanṭara).
14 manu-s or 7 manvantara-s	= 1 mahā-manvanṭara.

[1] Thus perhaps the octal and the decimal systems could both be reduced and merged into a system in which progress was in twos; so the apparent incompatibility between matter of three dimensions and matter of more or less dimensions so-called, would probably be removed if the 'atom' which is the 'greatest common measure' of both were found.

[2] Modern *Jyoṭiṣha* assigns 1,728,000, and 1,296,000 respectively to kṛṭa and ṭreṭā.

7 maha-man-vanṭara-s	= 1 nikṣha.
7 niksha-s	= 1 chārḍhya,
7 chārḍhya-s	= 1 ḍaiva.
7 ḍaiva-s	= 1 vinihiṭa-cycle.

This progress by sevens is endless. The cause of it is the quartette of cognition etc. By successive addition of each one of these four (to the quartette) we get 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 etc., endlessly (?)

Ordinarily, seven manvanṭaras are said to make a mahā-manvanṭara; but each manvanṭara is made up of the 'interval' between two Manus; hence 14 manus, complete the mahā-manvanṭara.[1]

[1] The ruler of the cycle is called Manu, and the period of his reign is also called manu here. The details, and the reasons for the details, of this table are naturally difficult to understand without much other information which is so far 'occult' and hidden from the public. There is also some discrepancy between the current Hinḍū notions on the subject of the manvanṭaras or the theosophical ideas of them (as stated in Mrs. Besant's note below) which would probably disappear if the requisite commentaries on the *Purāṇas* were available.

The Manu who rules over the period of manifestation is called the Root-Manu, since from him proceeds all growth during that period; the Manu

As a matter of fact, the knowledge of (our world's) y o g ī s and b r ā h m a ṇ a s does not extend beyond the limits of a m a h ā-m a n-v a n ṭ a r a in its past, present and future.

The ruler of a m a h ā-m a n v a n ṭ a r a is a Mahā-Vishṇu. Cycles beyond this and up to the v i n i h i ṭ a have been mentioned here only to indicate the endlessness of time. The Sun, which is the light of Mahā-Vishṇu, is the standard of measure of our world for time and space. By the movements of the Sun we have g h a t i, m a h ā-g h a t i, day, week, fortnight, month, and year. One sun illuminates one b r a h m ā ṇ d a, and includes seven planets in accordance with that same fourfold rule of cognition, etc., (and subsequent additions. Our seven planets are) Sūrya, Chandra, Bhauma, Buḍha (the son) of Shashī, Jīva, Bhṛgu and Shani.[1]

---

who rules over the period of p r a l a y a is called the Seed-Manu, since in him are gathered up all the results of the period of manifestation, and they mature in him during the time of rest. The period of manifestation is called the m a n v a n ṭ a r a, 'between (two) Manus,' and is under the Root-Manu. (A. B.)

[1] These are the same as those mentioned by current *Jyotiṣha*. The Sun and the Moon are obviously not 'planets' in the modern sense of the word; western astrologers recognise Mercury,

1 Sun with seven planets	= 1	brahmānda, revolving in a vast cycle, the maker and ruler of which is technically called Īshvara.
7 brahmāndas	= 1	jagaṭ, made and ruled by a Hari.
1000 jagaṭs	= 1	vishva, by a Hara.
15,000,000 vishvas	= 1	mahā-vishva, by a Pareshvara.
Two shaṅkhas of mahā-vishvas	= 1	loka, by a Parameshvara.
One Mahā-shaṅkha of lokas	= 1	mahā-loka, by a Maheshvara.
One hundred paḍmas of mahā-lokas	= 1	samsāra, by a Mahā-Vishṇu.

Venus, Earth, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, Herschel or Uranus, regarding the 'Moon' as substituted for the Earth, and the 'Sun' for Uranus. Some add Neptune. In the western horoscope, the Sun and Moon have their 'houses,' as powerful influences, and the nodes of the Moon, Rāhu and Keṭu are also recognised. The text making one Sun with seven, takes the theosophical view, in which the Sun is the eighth, and is not included in the seven. See *The Secret Doctrine*, i. 483, 578. The seven planets are the brothers of the Sun. (A. B.)

Mahā-Vishṇu presides over the summation and totality of all this. In every brahmāṇda the activity is fourfold, and the chief functionaries are Brahmā, Vishṇu and Shiva. Sub-divisions of their functions give rise to the names and offices of Nārāyaṇa, etc.

Among these functions, that of making or creating goes with action and belongs to Brahmā. Again, "that which has been made is maintained by knowledge"; this maintenance or preservation is the work of Vishṇu. Further, because it is necessary that what has appeared should disappear, therefore is there a destroyer, and he is Shiva, connected with desire (which first affirms and next denies, acts and reacts, now attracts and then repels, begins with craving for, and, after satiety, revolts from, its object and casts it off. It precedes action or Brahmā, as longing for manifestation; and it succeeds knowledge or Vishṇu, after maintenance or enjoyment of that manifestation, as a sense of fatigue, a growth of inertness, a need for rest by winding up the manifestation).

The significance of the tradition that Brahma is born from or in the lotus, is the same. The lotus symbolises a world-system, and Brahmā dwells therein representing action; he is therefore called the Kamal-āsana, the Lotus-seated. The lotus, again, is said to arise from or in the

navel[1] of Viṣhṇu, because the navel of Viṣhṇu or all-knowledge is *necessary desire,* the primal

[1] It is worth noting that in Samskṛṭ literature the navel is often treated as more central and almost more essential to the organism than the heart. Indications of the importance of the heart are not wanting, it is true, as, for instance, in the verse, राजा प्रजानां हृदयं गरीयः but it is probable that physiologically the 'navel' was the more vital organ in the earlier stages of evolution, and is even at the present stage more essentially connected with desire proper than the heart which may perhaps be regarded as connected with the actional sub-division of desire. The n ā b h i is said to be the principal seat of c h i ṭ ṭ a (at least while it is 'downward-turned,' towards things worldly and material). Compare the English expression 'the nave or hub of the universe'.

The 'navel' represents the solar plexus, perhaps the most important plexus of the sympathetic system; it controls the digestive tract, and sends its branches to liver, spleen, stomach, as well as to the alimentary canal and generative organs. Nor is it unconnected with the lungs and heart. It may be regarded as the brain of the sympathetic system, and responds with dangerous facility to thought; concentration on it, often rashly undertaken, is apt to result in a peculiarly intractable form of nervous disease. Emotions set up in it violent disturbances, and the feeling of a nausea, which often follows an emotional shock, is due to its excited action. (A. B.)

---

form of which, as embodied in the *Veḍa*-text, is : May I be born forth (as multitudinous progeny). From such central and essential desire, the will to live, arises the whole of becoming, all the operations, all the whirls and whorls, of change and manifestation which make up life. In such becoming dwells Brahmā, and from him and by him, *i.e.*, by incessant activity, arises and manifests the organised world, the ṭri-bhuvanam, the triple-world. Because first *manifested*, therefore is Brahmā *named* the first of the gods; by action is manifestation, and he is the actor; and because actor, therefore is he also sometimes called the preserver or protector of the world; for he who makes a thing desires also the maintenance and preservation of his handiwork, and, moreover, by the making of the thing supplies the basis and opportunity for the operation of preservation, which, in strictness, of course, belong to Viṣhṇu.[1]

Compare in this connexion, the statements in some of the 'minor' *Upaniṣhaṭs* as to the subdivisions of agni, *e.g.*, kāmāgni, koṣhṭhāgni, etc., and the transformation of these various 'energies' or vital forces into one another.

[1] In theosophical phraseology, the Third Logos (corresponding to Brahmā) manifests first, then the Second Logos (corresponding to Vishṇu) and finally the First Logos (corresponding to Shiva).

Birth, stay, and death; becoming, succession, relation; origin, middle, end; cognition, desire, action; such triplets make the World-process, and also each world-system, a ṭri-bhuvanam, a triple-world, a triple-becoming, a constant illustration of the tri-unity of the absolute Brahman.

SECTION III. *(Continued.)*

CHAPTER III.

THE COMPONENTS OF THE VEḌAS.

A résumé—Preliminary remarks about the nature and mutual relations of the *Praṇava*, the *Gāyaṭrī*, the *Mahā-vākyas* and the *Veḍas*.—The fruit of the study of these.

Whatever works are undertaken by jīvas, as we see in daily life around us, the methods of carrying them through are all first planned out in thought, and then only is action commenced. The case is the same with Mahā-Vishṇu. He who is the ruler of this samsāra[1] first ideates all the laws, methods, means and ends of its procession and then commences actual work. This very ideation of Mahā-Vishṇu, which is the method of the process of this world-system and which is also the operation or work of procession itself, is also the *Veḍa*, as said before. It is also Mahā-Vishṇu himself, for although the

[1] This word is used in this work in two senses, (i) the metaphysical, that of the World-process, the totality of all possible world-systems of all time and all space, and (ii) the empirical, that of a particular world-system, presided over by a particular Mahā-Vishṇu. When used in the former sense, it is spelt with a capital S.

matter that is thought about is, in one sense, different from the thinker, still, the latter, at the time of thinking, regards it as *within* himself and then thinks about it; and in that time there is no separateness between the thinker, the object thought about, and the thought; they are all three included in one. Yet, also, we distinguish between the three as separate things. The thinker is not the thought; and the object of thought, again, is different from both.[1] Thus paradoxical must always be the illustration of the whole by a part. And yet, although the fact illustrated is not exactly like the illustration, the latter may enable us to infer correctly what is the fact.

[1] The meaning of this and similar statements will become more and more clear to the reader as he proceeds further and realises more and more fully within himself the two aspects, with their corresponding standpoints, of (i) the universal, simultaneous and all-inclusive One and (ii) the individual and successive Many, dealing with the limited, the particular, the concrete, with one part at a time, in succession. The two aspects and standpoints are more or less clearly recognised in later German philosophy, though it seems to fall short of the final explanation, even as *current* Indian *Veḍānṭa* also just falls short of it. Whosoever has come to realise that the 'transcendental or metaphysical' point of view, as distinguished from the 'empirical

From Mahā-Vishṇu the subordinate three gods receive the necessary instruction in the

---

or experiential' point of view, is not mere verbiage but the very centre of reality, will find that for him the ordinary dark problems, paradoxes and perplexities of psychology, of life and the world, vanish in clear sunlight.

But in order that this realisation may be attained, the intensity of the sense of egoistic personality, of the separateness of jīva and jīva, of me and thee and he, must have been made at least milder and weaker if not wholly abolished by vairāgya. So only can it become possible to see and feel that 'persons' are only parts, limbs, organs, tissues of larger 'persons'; that the sense of 'personality' of the ḍevas differs very much in degree from that of fifth-race humans; that it is possible for the trinity of Brahmā, Vishṇu and Shiva to exist side by side like three persons as well as within one another, or even each other, like the physical, astral and mental sheaths of one jīva. (See *The Science of the Emotions*, 2nd ed. p. 245.)

The corresponding Samskṛṭ names for the two points of view are paramārṭha-ḍṛshti and vyavahāra-dṛshti. The importance of this distinction cannot be reiterated too often. (i) This principle of two different standpoints; (ii) The law of analogy, that nature repeats herself, on all possible scales, in space and time; (iii) The principle of reflexion, which is but another form of the law

Veḍas; and they in their turn pass them on to their own special subordinates. Because Brahmā

---

of analogy, that *a* whole endeavors to reproduce *the* Whole, but can only achieve a 'comparative' and never a complete perfection, at any point of space or moment of time; (iv) That nature or Prakṛṭi works by extremes, and the Truth ever lies in the mean—these are keys to all possible problems.

To illustrate: It has been said in Section. III. Chapter II above that 'thought and thing are one only from the standpoint of Brahman,' the Whole. But it is said here for a particular Mahā-Vishṇu also, that his ideation is the work of procession of his world-system and also his *Veḍa*. This should be understood only in a 'comparative' sense. Brahman is identical with the World-process in its Totality, and therefore is its material cause, as well as its efficient cause, as well as its instrumental cause, as well as its final cause etc. In imitation of this fact, a Mahā-Vishṇu also endeavors to become identical with his world-system; a 'small portion' of his vast body becomes the 'material cause' of all 'creatures' within his system; his will is the efficient cause of all processes within it; his imagination or ideation the instrumental cause of all forms in it; his self-realisation in and by means of the first individualised, and then 'universalised,' or, strictly, 'generalised' consciousnesses of all his 'creatures,' is the final cause, and so

is pre-eminently concerned with the action of promulgating them, hence, while Mahā-Vishṇu is the primary author of the *Veḍas*, Brahmā is said to be their revealer, and each one of the three gods is also said to be the author of that *Veḍa* which he specially carries into effect.

Mahā-Vishṇu's ideation, for the creation of his own world-system, begins after he has himself obtained the AUM, the *Mahā-gāyaṭrī*, appurtenant *Mahā-vākyas*, and the *Mahā-Veḍa* from a still higher deity. The *Praṇava*, however, is ultimate[1] and exists everywhere, before, behind and above Mahā-Vishṇu; it includes everything. In each, world-system, the Mahā-Vishṇu thereof corresponds to the totality of the *Praṇava*, and Vishṇu Brahmā and Shiva to A, U, and M, respectively.

---

on. In a certain sense, because all effects pre-exist in the cause, Mahā-Vishṇu *may* be regarded as wholly identical with his world-system; and so his ideation and the processes thereof *may* be regarded as one. But, again, because we are dealing with the limited here, and *not* the Unlimited, time and space cannot be really discounted, the identity is only *comparative* and not complete, and 'ideation' and 'realisation,' 'thought' and 'thing,' are not truly and wholly the same in any particular world-system.

[1] Not as a particular sound, but as the Thought, I-This-Not.

Of words, the sound AUM is the first, as of letters A is the first. Then comes the *Gāyaṭrī*[1]; and simultaneously with it the *Mahā-vākyas*. From these two arise the *Veḍas*. As all works, small and great, are first thought of in the mind, and then their methods of performance are planned out, and finally orders are given to the subordinate executors and the workers in detail—such is the mutual relation of the *Gāyaṭrī* the *Mahā-vākyas* and the *Veḍās*. The 'word' which embodies the proper time and season of the a v a ḍ h ā r a ṇ a, ideation, which embodies the knowledge that this-and-this fact arises from such-and-such a principle or seed or source, and that this is the appropriate method of bringing about this result and for this reason—this 'word' is the *Gāyaṭrī*. As the ordinary man carries the largest schemes in the mind by means of very small words, signs, symbols—even such is the case with Mahā-Vishṇu. The thought of Mahā-Vishṇu as to each principal method or law of the world-system is embodied in a *Mahā-Vākya*. Hence is it said that the *Gāyaṭrī* is the mother of the *Veḍa*, the *Mahā-vākya* the father, and AUM, the root of all, the grandfather of the *Veḍas*, wherein

[1] The *Gāyaṭrī* is the 'chant,' the sacred m a n ṭ r a or prayer and invocation, addressed to the Sun daily by every twice-born man. *Mahā-vākya* is 'great sentence,' logion.

the Trinity dwells and whence succession flows forth.

The non-separateness of the *Gāyaṭrī* and the *Mahā-vākyas* has been insisted on everywhere, because of their simultaneity. The distinction between them is the distinction between whole and part. The whole of all thinking is the *Gāyaṭrī*.[1] A *Mahā-vākya* is one portion thereof. The detailed expansion and working out of all these is the *Veḍa*. The *Gāyaṭrī* corresponds to cognition, the *Mahā-vākyas* to desire, the *Veḍas* to action, *i. e.*, to A, M, and U, respectively. Finally, the student obtains the true knowledge of the *Mahā-vākyas* and of the *Gāyaṭrī* only after having studied the *Aṅgas* and the *Upāṅgas*, the 'limbs' and the 'sub-limbs,' which bring out the truths of the *Veḍas*. The six *Aṅgas* are derived by the sub-division of cognition, and action into three each, *i. e.*, by cognition, desire and action; and the six *Upāṅgas* or *Ḍarshanas*, conversely, by the sub-division of cognition, desire and action, by the two, *viz.*, cognition and action. (?)

[1] All this chapter must be more or less hard to follow for the reader who has not had an opportunity of learning what the *Gāyaṭrī* or the *Mahā-vākyas* are. The chapters immediately following after this will help to explain. It may perhaps repay trouble if the reader returns to this chapter after having perused the next one or two.

The end and aim of all this study, which, indeed, is the highest ṭ a p a s, asceticism, aspiration, austerity, is to realise the summation of the whole of the World-process in AUM, the one partless idea A h a m-E ṭ a ṭ-N a, I-This-Not, which is the World-process and is also the one sole law of all laws governing it; and, after such realisation, to act accordingly, *i.e.*, to create new worlds, new b r a h m ā ṇ d a s, new households, small and large, microcosms and macrocosms. The purpose of evolution, the object of the creation of a b r a h m ā ṇ d a by an Īshvara, is the evolution of new Īshvaras and the creation of new B r a h-m ā ṇ d a s, in endless succession. The father 'makes' the son, and the son another son, endlessly (from the vastest sidereal system to a gnat); and this he does only as the result of attaining the father's knowledge and power of action. In the same way should every j ī v a learn the constitution and manner of building a b r a h m ā ṇ d a in order to create another in turn, in endless rotation corresponding with the endlessness of the *Praṇava*.

Such is the significance of the *Mahā-vākya*, 'I that am one, may I become many'. And everything follows this law, on all scales, as in the before-mentioned instance of seed and plant, which illustrates the universal pervasiveness of the law of the trinity, too, in the fact that the seed has one sprouting point between two lobes.

And it should be remembered that the mere scale does not matter, for greatness and smallness are essentially relative. The destiny of each atom is to create a brahmāṇda. Brahmāṇdas like or smaller or larger than ours, held together by a Sun, are present in every atom.[1] Vishvas, great world-systems, exist in an atom, and atoms again exist in these vishvas. This is the significance of 'many from one;' wherever we see the one we should recognise the many also, and conversely. After securingthe ability of, and then actually, creating a brahmānda, the next step is the creation of a jagaṭ, then a vishva, then a mahā-vishva and so on, till the status of Mahā-Viṣhṇu is reached. From this progression it follows that banḍha, bondage, and mokṣha, deliverance (in the sense of, i., restriction by and emancipation from certain *special, definite* kinds of *limitations*, and not of, ii., the universal limitation by the pseudo-abstract Ēṭaṭ or This, and the eternal transcendence in consciousness of such universal limitation by the Negation of the This) are both equally 'contingent,' relative. The smaller, emerging from his condition of bondage (within certain narrow limitations) comes out into another condition (which is one of *comparative* absence of

[1] For an excellent commentary on the literal truth of this statement see Fournier's *Two New Worlds* (published in 1908.)

restraint and limitation, because giving a wider range than the previous one, in space and time, but) which has its own limitations again. Thus, then, bondage and freedom are not to be thought of as things radically different. Mahā-Vishṇu is great and free as compared with an atom of his world-system; but he has his own pleasures and pains and bonds and limitations, in turn. It is true, he knows that all this World-process takes place because of s v a-b h ā v a, the 'own-nature,' 'own-being,' of B r a h m a n, and not through his personal power, and so far as he realises this he is truly m u k ṭ a, free, in the technical sense, yet he has to work as if believing in his possession of a personal power, as such work is also a necessary part of the process of 'becoming'. And therefore, from the standpoint of a higher on-looker, he also is but an atom, and in the same plight.[1]

[1] This way of putting the matter, it should be noted, deals with only one aspect of the question. It shows that every condition is, *simultaneously*, one of comparative bondage as well as comparative freedom. The other aspect, not immediately relevant to the text here, is that of the mutual and endless succession of bondage and liberation in the same way and sense as, though on a much vaster scale in time and space than, that of physical birth and death.

Therefore the one Universal Self alone should be regarded as the truly Blessed, permeated with AUM; and both bandha and moksha are in reality naught. There should be and is no craving for moksha left when this is realised, for such realisation itself is moksha, in the universal sense.

Naught can we say is small, nor call aught great. That which now seems an atom is, in truth, the maker and container of whole worlds. Infinity streams and surges everywhere. This is the highest knowledge, deepest bliss. This is the secret of the sacred books.

No *Viḍyā*, no *Veḍa*, the highest this Truth is,
No *Manṭra*, no *Yanṭra*, no fever of strife.
No *Ṭanṭra*, no sentence, no sound, and no language,
No *Yoga*, no *Sāṅkhya*, no order or law—
Ever the Being, the Living, the Blessed,
Beyond all the reach of cognition and sense,
The song of the AUM, and the being of Worlds,
And the one single source of the cosmos around,
Beyond all the senses, yet knowledge itself,
Self-proven, Self-chosen, the Law of the whole. [1]

[1] This is an attempt to reproduce, just for the information of the reader, the *metre* of the original shlokas; he will, it is hoped, not scrutinise too closely the merits of this and other similar versified reproductions, in this summary, of the metaphysical hymns of the original.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER IV.

The Components of the Veḍas. (*Continued.*)

The *Gayaṭrī* and the *Mahā-vākyas*.—Incidental remarks on the three forms of yoga, and on castes and âshramas.

The study of the *Gāyaṭrī* comes first. It is 'one-footed,' 'two-footed,' 'three-footed' and 'four-footed,' because the Samsāra is manifested in four ways, cognition, etc., by Mahā-Vishṇu's ideation. The *Gāyaṭrī* is as follows: 'That—the Father-Sun's excellent—splendor—of the God—may we contemplate—intelligences—which—our—may inspire'[1]. 'That—

[1] In other words: 'May we contemplate, receive, absorb or assimilate the radiant effulgence, the glorious energy, of the divine and all-creating Sun, so it may stir up, quicken, illuminate, inspire and vitalise our intelligences'. The collective 'we' and 'our' are especially worthy of note; each individual prays for the whole of humanity. The statement, at page 92, that the whole of all thinking is *Gāyaṭrī*, should be considered here. Apart from its symbolical and esoteric interpretations, even its plain word-meaning justifies the statement. All thinking, all research, is searching for relations; and all searching is praying, addressed deliberately or unconsciously to an individual deity or to the All-Self, the One Storehouse of True Omniscience and Omnipotence, whom the individual deity represents to the world-

the Father-Sun's'—this is the first foot. 'Excellent'—is the second, 'splendor—of the God'—is the third. 'May we contemplate—intelligences—which—our—may inspire'—this is the summation and the fourth foot. The first foot is cognition, the second action, the third desire, and the fourth the summation. [1]

According to the rules of the science of *Chhanḍah*, prosody, verses issue from each letter of the *Gāyaṭrī*, and they describe the methods on which the various parts of the world evolve, under the dominance of the AUM. Such is the greatness of the *Gāyaṭrī*. It includes all sciences, being itself the very essence of the ideation of Mahā-Vişhṇu. It is also called the *Sāviṭrī* [2], because it is the source of all sciences.

---

system he rules over. Zanoni says in the last chapter of Lytton's instructive novel of that name: "The thoughts of souls that would aspire as mine *are all prayer*." Prayer is asking, wishing, willing, putting oneself in the attitude to receive more fully; hence all effort is prayer, in one sense.

[1] Every Samskṛṭ verse has four parts, each called a pāḍa or foot. In English prosody the word has a different sense. The reason for the division and assignment to cognition, etc., is not clear.

[2] By current Samskṛṭ etymology the word means 'of or born from the Saviṭā, the *progenitor*, *i.e.*, the Sun.' In current Samskṛṭ, the word for 'progenitress' or 'source' would be saviṭrī, not sāvitrī.

The *Gāyaṭrī* is also said to be six-footed and eight-footed, etc., but this is because of the endlessness of number. Ordinarily, in this world, it is four-footed, as said before. Seven *Vyāhṛṭis*, 'exclamations,' 'utterances' precede it, being formed by the before-mentioned triple sub-division of each (of the two ?)[1], taken together with the summation. They are Bhūh, Bhuvah, Svah, Mahah, Janah, Ṭapah, Saṭyam. The whole is held together by AUM, as pervading and being the source of all. For this reason, in the exposition of AUM, Brahmā is said to be its ṛṣhi or seer, Gāyaṭrī[2] its metre, white its color, and utterance at the beginning of every work its use and employment. It is true that all ṛṣhis are the seers of AUM; yet, because of his special connexion with action, Brahmā is said to be its seer especially. The

[1] The reasons for the occurrence of a triplicity everywhere are obvious, but all other numbers may be regarded as arbitrary, *i.e.*, each number is special to one world-system. Ours, as is more than once stated definitely elsewhere in the text, is subject to the dominance of seven. But they are all always based on the three. The worlds or planes to which the *Vyāhṛṭis* correspond may also be looked upon as the 'utterances,' 'creations,' 'manifestations' of the creator.

[2] The name of the metre, as well as of the sacred verse which is in that metre.

Gāyaṭrī is based on and contained in it; hence it is its metre. The color is white, *i.e.*, luminous, for, as has been said, the *Praṇava* is of the nature of light, all-illuminating. It is employed at the commencement of all works because all action is rooted in it, and indeed everything else also is included in it.[1] The word v i n i y o g a, employment, signifies the same thing; v i is the Ā ṭ m ā, n i is the relation, y o g a is the world. That which is joined, combined, y u j y a ṭ i,[2] is y o g a. Because the trinity of the Self, the Not-Self, and the Negation is one, therefore is it present at the beginning of every work, and in it and after it and all around it, indeed, as well.

The *Vyāhṛṭi* indicates the particular kind of cognition, desire, action and summation (prayed for by means of the *Gāyaṭrī*, in the case of each class of praying individuals?). The *Gāyaṭrī* conveys knowledge of the totality (in each case). The *Vyāhṛṭis* are uttered to mark out each separate (summation). Because the root-facts are three, cognition, etc., the *Vyāhṛṭis* usually pronounced with the *Gāyaṭrī* are three, *viz.*, Bhūh, Bhuvah, and Svah (literally, the physical world or the earth, the next higher or astral, and 'heaven' or mental). These and the AUM

[1]This will become clearer later on, in the chapter dealing with the science of language and sound or *Vyākaraṇa*, grammar, (Sec. III, ch. xiii.)

[2]The modern form would be y u j y a ṭ e.

always go with the *Gāyaṭrī*; without them, indeed, the name g ā y a ṭ r ī itself would not be possible, for it means, 'that which sings, g ā y a n ṭ i, the three, ṭ r i ṭ a y a m, cognition, etc., as one, and also protects, ṭ r ā ṭ i, the total ideation by unifying it in the summation'[1]. The trinity becomes a septenary

[1] In view of other facts, statements of which are scattered all over the book, the text here may be expounded thus: The *Gāyaṭrī* is the embodiment in words of the psychic effort, *i.e.*, effort in and by consciousness or spirit, of the individual j ī v a to put its own consciousness in rapport with the cosmic consciousness; in other words, to put itself in rapport with the Solar Logos, the Logos of its own particular cosmos or world-system, cosmic consciousness here meaning not so much or so directly the Absolute Consciousness or B r a h m a n, as the consciousness underlying its own particular world-system, the consciousness of its Solar Logos. The fruit of such rapport, if achieved, is obvious; it is, in degrees varying as the degrees of the perfection of that rapport, the deriving of knowledge and power, inspiration in the fullest sense. But the solar consciousness is concerned, in this world-system, with seven planes, seven layers of being, seven interpenetrating worlds, Bhūh, Bhuvah, etc., or as they are designated in modern theosophical literature, physical, astral, rūpa-mental, etc.,these words having a double significance, that is to say meaning (i) various psychical conditions of the existing

also. Hence we have seven *Vyāhṛtis*, with seven ṛṣhis, seven ḍevaṭās, or gods, and

---

human being living normally in a physical body, as also (ii) the subtler and subtler grades of matter *in which* those conditions, though *subjective* or *spiritual* or *conscious* purely, from our physical waking standpoint and not material, are yet *formulated as material objects* to a higher. (The full significance of this may appear when the reader has read the rest of the work; it is attempted to be explained at length in *The Science of Peace*, pp. 295, *et seq.*) Now according to the world or layer or plane regarding which the jīva desires knowledge and power by means of his prayer, invocation, meditation, trance, transport, ecstasy, extasis, samāḍhi, is the *Vyāhṛti* that it pronounces. The human Āryan race, at its present stage, is dominated by intelligence, the fifth principle of theosophical literature, to which, as it is working in the human of to-day, corresponds the Svah world, or the mental plane; hence the Āryan ordinarily ends his utterance of the *Vyāhṛtis* with the third or Svah; he seeks knowledge and power primarily of the nature of intelligence; beyond that he cannot go yet; especially developed jīvas go higher.

It should be remembered that this statement gives us only one aspect of the *Gāyaṭrī*, only an idea of its general nature and significance. Its secret or technical interpretations and practical uses may be many. Thus, as said in the text itself, each letter of it symbolises a *Mahā-vākya*, a law of nature; and again, the chanting of it in special ways has special results, protective, destructive, creative etc.,

seven metres. Of these seven kramas, (orders, successions, rounds, chains, planes or worlds) the ṛṣhis are the niyanṭāraḥ, rulers, controllers, administrators; the ḍevaṭās are the maintainers, preservers; and the metres are seven kinds of sounds, words or languages, as the science of words says. The ṛṣhis are Vishvāmiṭṭra, Yamaḍagni, Bharaḍvāja, Gauṭama, Aṭṭri, Vasiṣhtha, and Kashyapa. The metres are Gāyaṭrī, Uṣhṇik, Ṭriṣhtubh, Anuṣhtup, Bṛhaṭī, Paṅkṭī and Jagaṭī. The ḍevaṭās are Agni, Vāyu, Āḍiṭya, Bṛhaspaṭi, Varuṇa, Inḍra, and Vishvéḍeva. Such is the arrangement under which work is begun and completed in every brahmānda of this samsāra.[1]

---

[1] It may be helpful to make a parallel: While a *Vyāhṛṭi* indicates a world (corresponding with a predominant bhūṭa, element, and a class of piṭṛs); the ḍevaṭā is its king, law-giver, and storehouse and reserve of protective, defensive and offensive military power; the ṛṣhi is the judiciary and executive, the carrier on of the daily administration, the seer, interpreter and applier of the law, acting between king and people; and the chhanḍah, the language of the law, the code, the statute-book, which prevails in and governs that world, and is the means of relation and communication between all. These three may be regarded as corresponding with desire, action, cognition and summation.

The meaning of the *Vyāhṛṭis*, from one standpoint, is this: That which 'becomes' is Bhūh; this is connected with Āṭmā. Its development, its combination with samsāra is Bhuvah, *i.e.*, kriyā, action. Svah is desire of the nature of negation; whence the exclamation svāhā that is uttered with every sacrificial offering into the fire, for by fire (or agni-ṭaṭṭva, corresponding with the manas, the intelligence, and the mental plane) is everything called, apprehended, attracted, āhūyaṭe, (to and by the sva, the Self), negation being the means of relation and therefore the cause of growth or evolution; (self-negation, abnegation, self-denial, self-sacrifice is the cause of development in more senses than one). The first is connected with Vishṇu or A, the second with Brahmā or U, the third with Shankara or M; and the *Gāyaṭrī* with Mahā-Vishṇu. Such is the ṭribhuvanam, triple-world, that exists in every atom. Self, (Āṭmā, that which always moves, aṭaṭi, hence standing here for motion) space and time, which are ever connected with Samsāra, also make it a true ṭribhuvanam.

The other four *Vyāhṛṭis* are differentiated out of these three. The 'great' root of the three is the fourth, Mahaṭ. The fifth is Janah; it gives 'birth' to all, hence the name. Ṭapah is the maintenance, the 'keeping alight,' the 'holding fast' of knowledge; it is a special form of kriyā.

Saṭyam is conjoined to all; for what is 'true' is immortal, the Self, connected with all. Thus are the seven *Vyāhṛṭis* related to *Gāyaṭrī*.[1]

The *Gāyaṭrī* has twenty-four syllables, through the multiplication of four by six[2] (?). But in

---

[1] In theosophical literature, as in Hinḍū, these seven 'worlds,' named the *Vyāhṛṭis*, are related to four out of the five already manifested 'planes' of our universe. Bhūh and Bhuvah are, as said, the physical and astral planes, while Svah is the lower or r ū p a-mental; Mahah is the a r u p a-mental, the 'formless' world of abstract ideas; it is the relatively permanent root, or world of causes, of the ṭ r i b h u v a n a m, the triple-world, below it; here is the home of the causal body, the 'higher heaven,' the heaven of the scholar of a high type, of the philosopher, to which belongs the v i j ñ ā n a-m a y a-k o ṣ h a. The Janah, Ṭapah, and Saṭya l o k a s are on the buḍḍhic plane; to the first go the highest type of those in whom cognition is predominant; to the second the highest type of those in whom desire is predominant, the noblest b h a k ṭ a s; to the third the highest type of those in whom action is predominant, the utterly unselfish workers. Beyond these yet again are Brahma-loka, Vishṇu-loka—Vaikuntha and Goloka,—and Shiva-loka,—Kailāsa—again repeating k r i y ā, j ñ ā n a and i c h c h h ā. (A. B.)

[2] It is difficult to say what this expression 'four by six' exactly means. It may mean the quartette of cognition, etc., multiplied by the six *Aṅgas* or

this manner, indeed, by successive multiplications, it is endless, and not limited to twenty-four letters.

Yogīs, siḍḍhas, jñānīs, 'the Self-joined, the perfect, the knowers,' because of their work in the world, have need of portions of the knowledge contained in the *Gāyaṭrī*. And the yogīs alone have the right to use all the seven *Vyāhṛṭis*, for according to the growth or stage of knowledge of the jīva is his right. The right to use the three *Vyāhṛṭis* belongs to all, for there is nothing apart from the trinity[1].

For this same reason, the action in prāṇāyāma, breath-regulation, is also three-fold: pūraka, inspiration, connected with cognition; kumbhaka, holding (in either deflation or inflation), with kriyā; rechaka, expiration, with the nexus or desire.

Yoga is of three kinds: rāja, lakṣhya, and haṭha. In the practice of the first, we have the restraint or inhibition of the transformations,

Upāṅgas, which, with their summation make up a septenary such as prevails in our world-system. Later on, it is said that the twenty-four letters indicate the twenty-four logia which, it is clearly suggested, are the variations, the various forms, in which the quartette manifests.

[1] And all live in the three worlds, inhabiting each in turn during a life-period, *i.e.*, from birth to birth. (A. B.)

psychoses, changes, states, of the chiṭṭa, mind, the outward-directed consciousness; this corresponds to Self and cognition. Hatha-yoga, dealing with prāṇāyāma, corresponds to action and the world. Lakṣhya-yoga to the Negation. Each is triple in turn[1]. The *Gāyaṭrī* is prescribed for the prāṇāyāma together with the seven *Vyāhṛṭis*; therein is the right to all knowledge; and therefore it follows that only for yogīs is prāṇāyāma fit and proper. For the purposes of ordinary japa, meditative repetition, the *Gāyaṭrī* with three *Vyāhṛṭis* is fittest; though, yet again, the only real and effective japa is the japa of the AUM alone, for the knowledge that comes to those who practice it is indeed the highest

[1] The text is silent as to the triplets under the other two forms of yoga, that under hatha-yoga being clearly said to consist of the three forms of breath. From one standpoint, it may be possible to regard the three states, mentioned in the *Lyāsa-Bhāṣhya* on the extant *Yoga-Sūṭras viz.*, viveka-khyāṭi, dharmamegha and kaivalya, as the three sub-divisions of the lakṣhya; and to group the first five 'limbs,' *viz.*, yama, etc., as a triplet under hatha; the last three falling under rāja. It may also be said that under rāja-yoga the three are ḍhāraṇā, ḍhyāna and samāḍhi and under lakṣhya-yoga, worship, rapture and extasy.

achievement, as is declared everywhere. The essential aim and significance of all this practice of yoga and *Gāyaṭrī* and AUM is the realisation of the Self, the Not-Self, and the Negation, the creation of new samsāras, the perfection of the absence of desire in the midst of all actions, and consequent identification with Brahman, for 'to move in all ways, as Brahman does, is to be moveless, as Brahman is'.

(The essential significance of mokṣha is the realisation of the relation of Negation between the Self and the Non-Self, and the leading of life as a matter of duty—*i.e.*, the discharge of *debts, due* from us to others from out of the past—in accordance with this realisation, within whatever limits of detail, cyclic and organic, our individual consciousness is confined for the time being. This realisation and practice, within larger and larger limits, brahmāṇda, jagaṭ, vishva, etc., makes the degrees, the grades, of *technical* mukṭi, as distinguished from the *essential* mukṭi, which may be possessed even by 'a mere shop-keeper' or 'a mere king actively ruling on earth,' as in the classical instances of Ṭulāḍhara and Janaka.)[1]

[1] The distinctions made in current *Yoga* works between kārya-vimukṭi and chiṭṭa-vimukṭi; and in current *Veḍānṭa* works between krama-mukṭi and saṭyo-mukṭi, though the terms are

The various prakāras, modes, of the *Gāyaṭrī*, are similar and simultaneous ideations. They are the four *Mahā-vākyas*, great-sentences, logia, one at the root of each *Veḍa* 'I am Brahman,' Aham—Brahm—āsmi, is the source of the *Ṛg-Veḍa*, corresponding to cognition. 'That I am thus—why is it so and what for?'—such is the significance[1] of the logion

interpreted differently now, seem to hint at the same thing. See also the illustrative story, in the *Bhavishya-Purāṇa*, III., iv., ch. VII., of the Brāhmaṇa Dhāṭrī-sharmā who became mukṭa, for a definite period, in the Solar Logos.

[1] The 'significance' of this and the next logion may be expanded thus. The Self *appears*, from the standpoint of the limited and successive, to ask Itself, 'I-am-I, but what am I, am I this and this and this, am I other-than-I, not-I, the many?' and then to say to Itself, 'Let Me try, let Me assume that I am the many, let Me become the many, "May I become the many"'. But in the next step it says, 'How is this possible, in what manner can I be or become the many? I cannot be or become other than I am, anything else than Myself, and there is nothing else than Myself, for I know only Me and nothing else than Me, and what I do not know does not exist, and therefore "there is nothing else."' (See *The Science of Peace*, chapters vi-vii-viii and p. 143 *et seq.* for an explanation of how this All-consciousness, I-This-Not, is arrived at by the jīva and of its essential and all-inclusive significance).

connected with the *Yajur-Veḍa* and action, *viz.*, Bahuh-syām, 'May I become many'. 'There is nothing here verily,' Na-eva-asṭi-iha-iṭi-kiñchana, is the basis of the *Sāma-Veḍa*, of the nature of the nexus, desire; its significance is 'How, in what manner, can I be?' Finally comes the logion of the *Aṭhara-Veḍa* and the totality, *viz.*, Aham-Eṭaṭ-Na-iṭi-ḍusṭaram, 'I-This-Not, the unpassable'[1]; it unifies in itself the other three and explains what is their use, motive, or final cause.

These four logia give birth to the four *Veḍas*. In them, Aham, I, is connected with cognition; Eṭaṭ, This, refers to kriyā; and Na, Not, to desire as the nexus. This trinity is unpassable, uncrossable, not to be transcended and got beyond, being everywhere and all-inclusive. The conjunction of Aham with Eṭaṭ is the birth of Samsāra; and of Eṭaṭ with Na is its negation or destruction. Therefore Aham-Eṭaṭ-asmi, 'I am This,' and Eṭaṭ-Na-Aham-asmi, 'I am Not This,' are also two *Mahā-vākyas*.

The separateness as well as oneness of these three, the Self, the Not-Self, and the Negation, ought to be thoroughly comprehended.

It is true that ordinarily Ṭaṭ-ṭvam-asi, 'That art thou,' Aham-Brahm-āsmi, 'I

[1] Compare the expression of *The Secret Doctrine*, the 'Ring-pass-not'.

am Brahman,' Sarvam--khalu-iḍam-Brahma, 'All this verily is Brahman,' and Na-iha-nānā- asṭi-kiñchana, 'There is no many here,' are called the four great sentences. Yet they are such only as means to the primal Logion, I-This-Not. Of these, the first refers to kriyā, wherein is formed the multiplicity of 'thou' and 'I' and 'this' and 'another,' and it is included in the second word of the Logion. The second is the jñāna-mode, included in the first word thereof. The third corresponds to desire wherein all is negated, and is comprehended in the third word. The fourth amounts to the summation.

So far we have had ten great sentences.[1]

'I am This'—such only is Samsāra. Herein is the combination of cognition and action; desire also is there. Hence arises the eleventh logion: Saṭyam-jñānam-ananṭam-Brahma, 'Brahman is truth, knowledge, endless'. Truth is Aham; knowledge is Eṭaṭ; endless is desire; and the three together are Brahman. By the conjunction of the Āṭmā with the Eṭaṭ arises cognition; knowledge is not possible while

[1] It is not easy to make out the ten. Even if slight verbal differences are reckoned, then too Aham-Brahm-āsmi occurs intact twice. Perhaps Aham-Eṭaṭ-Na is regarded as distinct from Aham-Eṭaṭ-Na-iṭi-ḍusṭaram. (?)

there is no conjunction of the two; that conjunction itself, indeed, is knowledge.

That which is knowledge is the truth, and the truth is also the knowledge, and the two together are also the endless.

Again, in the combination of Aham, Eṭaṭ and Na, a singleness is super-imposed on the whole by the verb-action 'am'[1]; the I is the This, the This is the Not, and that Not again is the I —such is the full significance of the combination. From this results the twelfth *Mahā-vākya*, Ekah-Aham-Bahu-syām, 'May the one I become many'. Here I corresponds with the one, This with the many; 'may become,' with the Negation. The real inner meaning of this is the logion 'May I not become this' (for I, the one, cannot really become the many) which only declares in another form the sense of 'I-This-Not-am.'

These are the twelve *Mahā-vākyas*. But the chief ones are the four above-mentioned; and even amongst them, the veriest root of all is 'I-This-Not'. Sometimes five main logia are spoken

---

[1] On the great value, the extremely illuminative significance, of translating all the ultimate world-problems from terms of the third person into terms of the second and first persons, and finally into the terms of the first person only, from terms of he, she, it, that, there, is, etc., into those of you, I, this, here, and finally of I, this, am, etc. see *The Science of Peace*, pp. 92, 93.

of, by counting 'I am This' and 'I am Not This' as one and treating that as the fifth.

The first mode of Mahā-Vishṇu's ideation refers to jñana; hence Aham. In the utterance of Aham we find only pure knowledge, the own nature of the Self. The second, referring to action, is Eṭaṭ. In the utterance of Eṭaṭ are understood 'That thou art' etc. This mutually opposed multiplicity that appears all around us, of thou, I, he, other, this, what, that, etc.—this is Samsāra. Manyness is declared of this only. And as descriptive of the various aspects and ways of conjunction of Eṭaṭ with Aham, are used the words cognition, recollection, retention, doing, causing, work or effect or action, actor, motive, engagement, attraction, etc. On the other hand, by the conjunction of Aham with Eṭaṭ are said to arise negation, destruction, prohibition, conation or volition, desire, will, hope, expectation of return, 'evil hope' or despair, etc. All this is understood in the three words 'I-This-Not.' All sciences expound but these, and all sciences are necessary to understand their full significance. Asmi, am, is but another form of the AUM.

Because of the affirmation as well as negation involved in the ordinance 'This (is) Not,' there arises the opposition or contradiction that we see in the Samsāra. Separately, I is Not, This is

Not, Not is Not. When the I combines with This-Not-am, then the fruit of the Negation (*i.e.*, m u k ṭ i) is obtained.

Thus, then, the Logion related to the summation is A h a m-E ṭ a ṭ-N a ; and there are three other logia, severally related to cognition, desire and action. By the division of the fourth or primal Logion into cognition and action (A h a m-E ṭ a ṭ), and into action and desire (E ṭ a ṭ-N a), we have the fifth. By further sub-division of these in the way of changes of order of the factors, as, *e. g.*, the summation of cognition, desire and action ; or of desire, action and cognition ; and so on, we have twelve. By further permutations we obtain twenty-four, which may be regarded as the more important ones. They are indicated by the twenty-four letters of the *Gāyaṭrī*. These should be meditated on for finding out the separate method or law of the World-process indicated by each ; above them are the twelve ; above them the four ; and finally the one Logion which is the fount and source of them all.

There are endless others besides, produced by the endless permutations and combinations of A h a m-E ṭ a ṭ-N a, and because of which is A h a m-E ṭ a ṭ-N a declared to be 'impossible to pass beyond.' That is impossible to pass, the permutations and combinations of which are

beyond counting. On the other hand, from the point of view of the inner relativity and similarity or analogy, all is easy of comprehension; that is to say, if we realise that all this seemingly overpowering endlessness of the object-world is *relative* and *caused* by the endlessness of only our own consciousness, our Self, then the whole of the World-process becomes simple and easy to grasp, in one act of consciousness, at once. In the supreme idea, I-This-Not, there is no relativity; it is the Absolute that transcends all, includes all, pervades all, while separate and distinct from everything at the same time. By means of and as comprehended in this Law of laws, this great Logion, should the whole of Samsāra be viewed, in order that it may be comprehended truly, for in each individual atom is present this trinity, and nothing else than this trinity, of the Self, the Not-Self, and the Negation.

The four great logia have been promulgated by Mahā-Vishṇu; they represent his ideation of the methods of creation. The other logia have been promulgated by Vishṇu, Brahmā and Shiva, and are also ideations of methods. Later on, in the order of their ideation, *i.e.*, of the ideation of the *Mahā-vākyas*, the detailed method of the coming forth, the becoming, of Samsāra was shown; and that was the *Veḍa*.

'I-This,' 'This-Not-I,' 'Not-This-I,' 'Not-I-This,' 'I-Not-This'—such combinations make Samsāra. Space, time and substance[1] appear here. 'I-This' is time; for the conjunction and disjunction of Eṭaṭ with Aham is successive; and time is nothing but sequence, the succession of events, the birth and death of things. The conjunction itself (*simultaneous* as it is with negation and disjunction) is transcendental; but definite succession appears therein (in dealing

[1] Normally, the third of this triplet would be 'motion'. For the special purposes of the occasion, it is customary, in the old books, to replace any one of such a series by a corresponding item of any corresponding series. To the alert student, such at first sight perplexing 'shiftings,' become, by and by, clues to an indefinite expansion of 'scientific' knowledge, by giving 'points of contact' between different series, from which 'similarity in diversity' may be traced and analogies and correspondences established. The old *Upaniṣhaṭs*, scriptural writings generally, and aphorisms, *Bhāṣhyas*, and *Tanṭra*-works have to be studied with this rule in mind. This method has been adopted inevitably for making the work of teaching and learning briefer —as in the case of mathematical symbols. The substitution of substance for motion will become intelligible from the consideration that, from certain standpoints, motion as well as substance correspond with the M of the *Praṇava*.

with the many of the Eṭaṭ).[1] 'I-This' and 'This-I' are mutually dependent as well as independent. 'I-This' is the beginning. 'This-I' is the middle. 'I-ness in This' is space. 'This-Not' is substance. 'Not-This-I' is the end. 'This-Not-I,' is the endless. 'I-This-Not,' is the beginningless. 'I-Not-This,' is the beginning. In this manner does one sentence explain all things[2]. The permutations of this one Logion embodied in the AUM give rise to all activity, which indeed is nothing else than the endless and beginningless transmutations of A into U, of U into A, of both into M, and *vice versa*.

---

[1] In other words, the conjunction itself, from the transcendental point of view, is *simultaneous* with the disjunction. I-This and (I-)Not-This are uttered simultaneously *out of time*, but *in time* they follow sequentially. (E. H. Bellairs.)

[2] Unfortunately very often not to the present-day reader so far as any particular details are concerned! If he is earnest and diligent however, he will not fail to catch some glimpse of the significance of each permutation even with reference to any particular detail. This glimpse is, it should be noted, slightly easier to catch in the original Samskṛṭ than in the English translations, for the 'construction' of and in the two languages is different, and the same, that is, equivalent, words, if arranged in the same order, convey different effects in the different languages.

This combination of I and This is the only and the supreme māyā or illusion. Herein appear space, time, substance, transformation, non-transformation, evolution, beginning, end, middle, order, disorder, reconciliation, transcendence, non-transcendence, comprehension, existence, non-existence, illusion, realisation, oblivion, imagination, appearing, disappearing, becoming, etc. And hence is it said that there is nothing at all in the I taken separately by itself; though indeed such separateness is not possible. It is true the teaching is: Pass out of Samsāra and behold the Āṭmā. But it means only this *viz.*, See not only the This but also the I and the Not, for without these two the Eṭaṭ cannot appear, indeed even the very word 'appear' could not be uttered. Passing out of Samsāra consists in beholding it *under qualification by* I and Not.[1] So the Self too ought to be seen only as qualified by the Not-Self and the Not. By itself, Aham is not or nothing, Eṭaṭ is not, and Not is not, also.

It is true that we meet with such expressions as 'I am,' 'This is,' 'This is not,' 'I am not,' etc.

[1] It may be said that Samsāra is transcended when the Aham—which had identified itself with the Samsāra and had acted as if it were the Samsāra—withdraws into itself and says: "I am not This, I am I." Then Samsāra loses its binding force and is seen as the Not-I. (A.B.)

wherein I and This are found separate, still on analysis we find that they are both there and as one. The I cannot stand for a moment without the This, nor is the This anything without the I. When a This is mentioned separately, or as separate, in appearance, even then there is an implicit reference to another I (as en-*soul*-ing en-*liven*-ing, that This, and also to another This as en-*form*-ing, en-*sheath*-ing, the previous I)[1]. Thus then Aham-Eṭaṭ-Na is ever one. In the science of language, for instance, we see that though each letter exists separately, still it is only when they combine together that they fulfil their purpose of forming words possessed of significance; otherwise they remain lifeless. In this same way the trinity in the primal Logion has a unity of meaning. Indeed, so pervasive is this tri-unity that there is a trinity in each of the words Aham, Eṭaṭ and Na. Aham is made up of three letters; A is the Self, ha is the world, m is that which is beyond both and connects both. Eṭaṭ is similar; E is the Self, ṭa is the world, and ṭ

[1] This sentence seems to refer to the fact that however much 'inwards' we go, whenever we think we have separated the I, as our inner self, from the body, as our outer sheath, we still find this inner I only as a subtler body, made of subtler matter, body within body, layer after layer, plane after plane. See *The Science of Peace*, p. 273 *et seq*.

(otherwise ḍ) is the third or Negation. The Na being included in the Eṭaṭ, there is no clear expression of trinity therein; yet even there, according to the rules of the being or constitution of letters, varṇa-saṭṭā, (?), na is made up of a, ñ, and m. There is a similar trinity in every letter whatsoever.

In this fact we find the explanation and justification of the declaration 'I am (or is) Brahman,' *viz.*, that the Aham is also a trinity; otherwise, without the presence of the trinity therein, the identity of Aham with Brahman were impossible.

Thus understanding the significance of the Logion, the jīva comprehends the transcendent nature of all things. Without such understanding mokṣha is not possible. With this knowledge, mokṣha is gained, and it is seen that 'This-Not-I,' 'Not-I-This' and 'I-This' constitute the essence of all kriyā or action implying creation, destruction and preservation[1]; and then only does the creation of a new

[1] We may endeavor to understand the significance of this statement somewhat in this fashion: 'I-am-*This*' is the birth of the I into the This, and the manifestation, the coming into existence, of the This, of an organism, infinitesimal or nebula-vast, by means of the borrowed being of the Self; it is creation. '*Not-I*-but-only-*This*,' is the deeper and deeper mergence of the spirit into matter, it is the

brahmāṇda and the due regulation of life in the āshramas become possible and proper.

All the ḍharma, the duty, of all the castes and all the life-stages is thus included in the *Praṇava.* Aham is brahmacharya; he alone who knows the I as the basis and support of all is the brahmachāri. 'I-This' is the household, wherein the process of the world is carried on by the conjunction of the I and the This, and by the constant giving to the This-es, *i.e.*, other-I's, other selves, of what is gained (out of the one I) by the I's, the selves. 'This-Not' is the forest life wherein the nothingness of the This is realised. Finally

---

nourishment, evolution and further confirmation of the sheath of the soul; it is the consolidation of the manifesting world; it is maintenance and growth and preservation. 'Not-*This*-but-only-I,' is the withdrawing of the Self away from matter towards and into Itself; it is the gradual decay and dissolution of the outer body by the retirement of the consciousness which vivified it and held it together; it is the re-absorption, the pralaya, the death and destruction of the world-system, microcosm or macrocosm. This note should be read in connexion with the previous notes, at pp. 22 and 117 and may then help to show that the ringing of changes on the Logion with alterations of emphasis and order of the words brings out new and important meanings, 'methods' and 'laws of nature.'

'This-Not-I' is sannyâsa, wherein is gained the full knowledge that the This is the I and the I is the This and that apart from the This the I is Nothing, or, in other words, that the This alone is Nothing, and the I alone is Nothing, and that only the combination of the three in one is the Truth and the whole Truth.

So, too, with the castes.[1] Aham-Eṭaṭ-Na—this full knowledge makes the brāhmaṇa. 'I-This'—this much knowledge only is the mark of the kṣhaṭṭriya, *viz.*, that the eṭaṭ or 'this' world is protected by aham or 'me' alone, and that this protection is the duty of aham, or myself. 'This-Not' constitutes the vaishya; he knows that this world is nothing and by that knowledge controls, vashīkaroṭi, his senses. 'I-Not' makes the shūḍra; he forbids all egoism to himself and knows that all that really is is the true I, the

[1] Brâhmaṇa means 'the knower of Brahman,' the priest, the teacher, the scientist, the literary worker, the educator; kṣhaṭṭriya, 'the protector from wounds' the soldier, administrator, officer, ruler; vaishya, 'the appropriator and distributor, or pervador and provider,' the business man, the merchant, the agriculturist, the cattle-owner; shūḍra, 'the remover or driver away of care and sorrow,' the thoughtless, un-thinking server, himself free of care, the servant and laborer. See note at pp. 50-51 *supra*.

one Self, and thus performs his selfless work of serving all beings. Hence the saying that, by following the ḍharma or duty of varṇa or caste and āshrama or life-stage, man attains to the knowledge of Brahman.

In whom this knowledge of Aham-Eṭaṭ-Na arises, for him is the joy of mokṣha. He who knoweth this, knoweth Brahman; he verily becometh Brahman. He knoweth the essence of his own Self, he knoweth all as him-Self. This is the sacred hearing, this is the sacred thinking, this is the sacred meditating, shravaṇa, manana and niḍhyāsana[1]; this is memory, this is yoga, this is the whole of action. He who knoweth this, he alone is the performer of duty, he is liberated, he is the true brāhmaṇa; he knoweth himself as dwelling in all, as embracing all, as being all.

Achieved by the AUM, the ever Free,
Yet ever Void of freedom, Bound in bonds,
Devoid of yoga, One eternally,
And birth and union and death in one,
The Self, the Essence and Prime Truth of all,
The This, the ever-shifting scene spread round,
The Not, negating yet affirming all;
The Atom, yet pervading all the worlds,

[1] This is the spelling in the text, not the modern niḍiḍhyāsana.

The One, and yet the Many, Guṇa-less,
Yet source of all the guṇas ever known,
The Secret of all secrets, the One Source
Of all Self-posed appearances of Self,
Self-proven, Formless, Formed of Itself,
Brahman, Supreme Necessity of all.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER V.

THE ṚG-VEḌA.

The *Veḍas.*—The *Ṛg-Veḍa.*—The nature of its contents.

The World-process is said to be ṭri-guṇa in its nature; the three guṇas or attributes being saṭṭva, rajas, and ṭamas. Saṭṭva is cognition; rajas, action; ṭamas, desire; the summation of the three is the fourth (*viz.*, life or consciousness). The birth, maintenance, and death of sāṭṭvikas, *i.e.*, all things or objects in which the saṭṭva-attribute predominates, and their fruits are described in the *Ṛk*; the origin and activities etc., of the rājasas, in the *Yajuh*; of the ṭāmasas, in the *Sāma*; the summation of the three, the accomplishment of their conjunction, the connexion of cause and effect, and the relation of all things whatsoever to each other—all this is explained in the *Aṭharva.*

It is said sometimes that the *Ṛk* is for the accomplishment of karma or action, and the *Yajuh* and the *Sāma* for that of jñāna or knowledge. But the main interest of the *Ṛk* is jñāna, and it is 'for the accomplishment of karma' only because jñāna is necessary to

karma. So the *Yajuh* and the *Sāma*, dealing with karma (and ichchhā) mainly, give to jñāna its proper scope and purpose *by* such treatment of karma, action being the very fruition of knowledge (through desire).

Brahmacharya is realised by means of the *Ṛk*; gārhasṭhya of the *Yajuh*; vānaprasṭha of the *Sāma*; and sannyāsa of the *Aṭharva*. Thus do the four āshramas correspond to the four *Veḍas*.

Within each *Veḍa* there is again a similar subdivision according to this law of four. In the *Ṛk*, jñāna is prevailingly combined with each of the four. Hence it has sixteen mandalas, 'circles,' chapters or sections. Strictly, indeed, there are known to be twenty-four mandalas by rule (?); but eight are included in the samāhāra, summation, as connected with ichchhā (?); and so only sixteen are mentioned. All knowledge whatsoever in respect of earth, water, air, fire, and ākāsha, and time, space, and motion, is to be found in the *Ṛk*. It is true that sacrifices, etc., are possible with the manṭras of the *Ṛk*; but this does not disprove the fact that their main purpose is cognitional. Otherwise indeed specification were impossible, for cognition exists everywhere, and action exists everywhere, and desire exists everywhere and

always also; and there is no cognition without action, and no action without it either, and neither of the two others without the other two, for the aggregate of three is S a m s ā r a.

The name ṭ r i-b h u v a n a m, the triple-world, follows the ṭ r a y ī, the triple-*Veḍa.*

The ordinary teaching is that *two* v i ḍ y ā s, *viz.*, a p a r ā and p a r ā, lower and higher, nearer and farther, concrete and abstract, should be acquired. But from one point of view the two make but one. P a r ā is knowledge merely; a p a r ā is that knowledge combined with, put into, action or practice. In terms of the Logion, 'I' is the p a r ā-v i ḍ y ā; 'I-This' is the a p a r ā; 'I-This-Not' is beyond both, it is the m a h ā-v i ḍ y ā, 'the great science.' The three correspond respectively to A, U and M. The totality of them all is the p a r a m ā or supreme v i ḍ y ā, which is the bestower of m u k ṭ i, and indeed is itself m u k ṭ i, 'ever intent on the good of all.'

The whole of this v i ḍ y ā is expounded in the sixteen m a n d a l ā s of the *Ṛk,* and therefore is it called the m a h ā-m a n d a l ā, etc. These sixteen m a n d a l a s expound the A h a m while the other eight deal with the s a m ā h ā r a which is included in k r i y ā (?) as said before. The *Ṛk* is therefore also called the *Vishṇu-samhiṭā.* The first m a n ṭ r a of the first m a n d a l a thereof indicates its concern with cognition:

Agnim-īḍē-purohiṭam, etc. In agni, A means Aham, g is the Eṭaṭ, and ni the Negation. The form of that agni is light, luminosity. It is true that light is not possible without darkness; but darkness is also inclusively declared here by the word light. Darkness is nothing different or apart from light. As between I and This, so between light and darkness, there is no separateness, nor any precedence and succeedence. 'Agni whose nature is light, the Truth of Brahman, that we would know'—such is the meaning of the manṭra. It indicates enquiry after Brahman, knowledge of which is necessary, for without that knowledge no karma is possible. Having learnt the luminous nature of agni we shall gain 'the Immortal God of sacrifice,' yajñasya-ḍevam-ṛṭvijam. This is the 'chief object or motive,' raṭnaḍhāṭamam. The whole work of this agni, *viz.*, all knowledge, is declared in the *Ṛk*, whereby the jīva obtains 'the first,' puro-hiṭam, *i.e.*, the truth of Brahman.[1]

[1] The agni-ṭaṭṭva is predominant on the mental or Svah plane; also the etymological explanation of the word, according to *Nirukṭa* agre agryam nayaṭi 'that (*viz.*, intelligence, which leads on, in front, the good or high-aspiring jīva to That which is before all, the Best.' It is for this reason that the prevailing 'deity' of the Āryan Race *i.e.*,

Thus is the whole of the *Ṛg-Veḍa* concerned with cognition. "This is born from this; this is destroyed by this; this stands here; this is the time for this; this the place; this is the sub-division of that; the unity and not separateness of the parts in the whole; the cause of the appearance of separateness; considerations of manyness and non-manyness; the necessity of the two; that from which all beings have and shall come forth, that 'becoming' which is the basis of and is the World-process; that from which or on or because of which the Self stands forth or manifests; the laws under which it is converted and perverted, proverted and inverted"—all this knowledge is and is in the *Ṛg-Veḍa*. Whatever element of cognition exists in action or desire or summation, and the manner in which it intertwines with the other elements, of desire and action; also all that is needed for the understanding of the A h a m and the E ṭ a ṭ and whatever is included in both and in the Negation, and also in the logion Not-This-I—all this knowledge, contained in the *Mahā-vākyas* which are the ideation of Mahā-Vishṇu, is expounded here with its motives, necessity and contingency.

---

the fifth root-race and sub-races, (whose main purpose is to develope the 'fifth principle' or intelligence, m a n a s) is a g n i in some form or other, light, fire, the Sun, glory, radiance, lightning, etc.

(In other words : the causes of the origins and destructions of all things; the proper place of each in the World-process; the spatial and temporal extents of all cycles; the growth of individuals out of species and genera, *i. e.*, differentiation, the gradual multiplication of objects by sub-divisions, or embodiment of archetypes and types into concrete individuals; the growth of the heterogeneous out of the homogeneous; and, again, involution, the return of the heterogeneous into the homogeneous, the constant unification of many-seeming things; briefly, the whole of 'becoming' wherein the Self appears to undergo transformations of all possible kinds, to become changed into its very opposite and then to return to its own primal form, to now follow the path of pursuit and now of renunciation—the whole of this is described in the *Ṛg-Veḍa*, and the element of cognition is particularly traced and described in all its ramifications through all desires and actions.)

(It may be asked why j ñ ā n a is thus put first by identifying it with the *Ṛg-Veḍa*, the first-mentioned of the *Veḍas*.) Ordinarily, k r i y ā is mentioned everywhere as first; Brahmā, Viṣhṇu and Shiva—such is the usual order of mention? The answer is that this is so merely because k r i y ā only is first *seen*; only action *appears* visibly everywhere. Indeed, appearance *is* k r i y ā. Therefore is Brahmā mentioned

first. Otherwise, indeed, Mahā-Viṣhṇu, Viṣhṇu, Brahmā, Shiva,[1] is the proper order. (But, from the transcendental standpoint, the order really does not matter). The AUM includes all simultaneously and all permutations of all also, and priority and posteriority are verily nothing. In order that there may be priority and posteriority, there must be separateness; and cognition, desire and action are truly not separate but always coexistently correlated in a constant summation. The appearance of separateness gives rise to the appearance of succession, hence the mention of cognition as first, etc.

---

[1] Taking the order in consciousness, *viz.*, cognition, desire and action, one would say that the order should be (Mahā-Viṣhṇu), Viṣhṇu, Shiva, Brahmā, which, being rotated, will give the current order also, thus: (Viṣhṇu, Shiva) Brahmā, Viṣhṇu, Shiva, (Brahmā) etc. But as the reader proceeds further he will see, as has been already stated in a previous note, that from different standpoints different orders appear to prevail, each having its own significance, though it is not always easy to see that significance. Thus, from the standpoint of manifestation as embodied in the three facts of creation, preservation, and destruction, or birth, life and death, it is obvious that the proper order is Brahmā, Viṣhṇu and Shiva or s a ṭ, c h i ṭ and ā n a n ḍ a. Again from the standpoint of the working of consciousness in the individual as shown in the three facts of cognition,

Thus, then, is the Truth of Brahman expounded in the *Ṛg-Veḍa*. This is the mahāviḍyā. By the I, the This; by the This, the I; the I in the This; the This in the I; such is the nature of knowledge or cognition. Indeed it is only the conjunction of Aham and Eṭaṭ that is spoken of as cognition. Hence is it said that the *Ṛg-Veḍa* guides memory, forgetfulness and expectation. Therefore also is it said: Behold the Āṭmā by the *Ṛg-Veḍa*; the Āṭmā

---

desire and action, the proper order becomes Vishṇu, Shiva and Brahmā. From a third standpoint, that of the 'object' of conscious life, we note that it is first cognised, then grasped and then yields pleasure or pain as the case may be, and this gives us the order of the attributes of the Not-Self, saṭṭva, rajas, and ṭamas or Vishṇu, Brahmā and Shiva, *i.e.*, the order followed in the Purāṇic statement that Brahmā was born from Vishṇu, and Ruḍra or Shiva from Brahmā. To a fourth view, that of a concrete portion of the Not-Self, regarded more as an independent something having an existence of its own and less as an object of enjoyment, the substantiality of the thing is most and first apparent, then its qualities in detail, then its movements, and so we have ḍravya, guṇa and karma, or Shiva, Vishṇu and Brahmā. The why of each particular order is matter for further metaphysical cogitation; the rule of reversal in reflexion will probably explain much.

beholds the Ā ṭ m ā. So should the *Ṛg-Veḍa* be understood as embodying all knowledge—knowledge bound up with action, desire, and summation, indispensable everywhere, pervading all, of the very nature of the all, the whole law of all procession, expounded in twenty-four m a n d a - l a s, bestower of all wishes, the accomplisher of everything.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER VI.—Sub-Section (i).

THE YAJUR-VEḌA.

The *Yajur-Veḍa.*—The nature of its contents.—The nature of k r i y ā.—The relation of action to m o k ṣ h a.—The various kinds of m o k ṣ h a.

The *Yajur-Veḍa*, promulgated by Brahmā, is concerned with action. All the laws and methods of all actions whatsoever, from the origin to the dissolution of a world; the working of causes; the connexion of cause and effect, of actor and cause; the relations of actor, cause, effect and motive, with all of which every action is always conjoined; the necessity of all these—whatever, briefly, is included in U, the E ṭ a ṭ-factor of the Logion, that makes the contents of the *Yajuh*.

Thus, we hear: 'From ā k ā s h a was born v ā y u, air; from v ā y u, a g n i, fire; from a g n i, ā p a h, water; from ā p a h, p ṛ ṭ h v ī, earth; from p ṛ ṭ h v ī, o ṣ h a ḍ h ī, herbs; from o ṣ h a ḍ h ī, a n n a, food or corn; from a n n a, r e ṭ a s, seed, germ-sperm; and from r e ṭ a s, all else'. Such is the course of procession, s a m s a r a ṇ a or evolution. (In other words, from the elemental and mineral kingdoms arose the vegetable, and out of the latter, the animal kingdom).[1] Now the

[1] Or, in still later though as yet more unsettled and doubtful language, out of the primary elements

cause of the birth of vāyu from ākāsha, and of the origin of everything else successively, may be learnt from the *Yajuh*.

The essence of kriyā is the 'existence' of the Eṭaṭ in the I; first the identification, 'I am This, and This, and This,' and again the separation, '(I am) Not This, nor This, nor This, etc.' It appears as the birth, preservation and dissolution of everything. These three are mutually cause and effect. Without any one of these the others are impossible. And hence they are always changing places, *i.e.*, may be described in terms of each other. Death is also but a birth, for everything is indestructible and only changes form, so that death is the birth, the taking on of, a new form, even as birth is the death of an old form. Maintenance is also birth, in a similar way; for it depends on birth, and birth is momentary, so that maintenance is a continuous series of births.

In kriyā also, as in jñāna, by combinations with jñāna etc., there arise twenty-four kinds. [1]

The essence and truth of kāma, active desire, creative love, is also to be found here, in the *Yajur-veḍa*, by the combination, samparivar-

---

was born the vegetable bacterial cell and out of that the animal cell or protozoon.

[1] See p. 126 *supra*.

ṭana (?), of jñāna (with kriyā?, because of kriyā's coupling with jñāna?).

Thus are birth, maintenance and death and their summation all included here, and each being sub-divided into ten (?) we have the forty chapters of the *Yajuh*.

In each atom do we observe incessant kriyā; it is the one means of accomplishing anything and everything. Hence it is necessary to study the nature of action as connected with desire, cognition and the summation.

Even after attaining mokṣha, work has to be done. From the point of view of transcendence and endlessness, none is bound and none free. True, it is said that such and such action should be done for the sake of mokṣha[1] (the implication being that after mokṣha there is no more action to do). But this (in the outer sense) refers only to some particular condition from which specially is mokṣha or freedom to be gained. The inner significance of the counsel is that action should be performed always and in such a manner that universal mokṣha, eternal bliss, may be enjoyed always. To know that this is so is itself mokṣha; it is itself bliss. This constant restlessness and trouble of mind that we suffer from, *viz.*, if I do so, such will be the result, I have omitted to do this, I am doing this, I have done this, etc.,—to enable

[1] See *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*, iii, 19, 20.

jīvas to escape from this constant harassment is the one aim of all counsel. All is to happen, all will be done, and all will result therefrom, I have done everything, I am doing everything, all has been and is being and will be accomplished by me, all is necessary, all is certain, nothing is done by the limited me or thee or another, I and thou and another are nothing, what thou art that same am I and another is the same too, all is done by all—this realisation itself is mokṣha and bliss.

Thus, then, action, motion or movement, is a transcendental fact belonging to all time, and mokṣha is not something separate by itself which may be left behind after eliminating all other things. It is rather an all-pervading fact, immanent and included and concealed inseparably within the process of the world, stretching everywhere, in all ways and in all time.

So long as the jīva does not attain universality, so long as it does not realise its own universality, the identity of its individual with the universal consciousness, so long it does not attain contentment; and so long as it does not attain contentment it cannot become free from joy and sorrow. It may be said that universality is something transcendent and beyond time, and hence the *attainment* of such peace and contentment, within time, *at* some time, is im-

possible. But even this knowledge itself is based on contentment (*i.e.*, the impossibility of contentment *within* time is not realised till the contentment *beyond* time has been touched, felt, sensed, by the self turning inwards and contrasting its own *ever*-abiding universality with the limitedness of all particulars).

One hears it said: 'This man is content; he is at rest; he has ceased from action; his business is finished; his work is done'. The meaning of contentment here is but this, *viz.*, that that jīva possesses the knowledge that this World-process is endless and beginningless, past knowing (in completeness of details) and yet not past knowing (in all-comprehensiveness of universal law); that there is no real gain or loss, no honor or dishonor, nothing attained or unattained; that all that occurs is predestined from and for all time. Ceasing from action, again, is but ceasing from the belief that the result, the fruit, of action is for me or thee or another. Otherwise, indeed, action, motion, is a ceaseless fact.[1]

[1] In other words, whatever *appearance* of truth there is in the remark that is made from time to time by an individual as regards another individual, 'This man is content, is at rest, has retired from the worry and bother of incessant activity, (which is inseparable from the *personal* feeling), *i.e.*, has nothing *more* to do, has achieved the end he had set before himself for the time,' is in reality a *reflexion*, in the limited, of the real

Hence even after mokṣha, the performance of paramārṭha-work, the acts of duty, remains of necessity; and thus it comes about that jīvan-mukṭas become the regulators, guides and hierarchs of world-systems.

The expression, jīviṭa-mukṭa[1] or jīvan-mukṭa, the 'living-free,' implies a specific kind of mukṭi, and also the existence of non-jīviṭa-mukṭas. A jīviṭa-mukṭa is he who knows Brahman in all its tri-unity; whereas one may be a mukṭa who knows even but one of the three factors of the Absolute. Thus he who knows, *i.e.*, fully believes that the Samsāra, the World-process, is eternal and must always be kept up, that we have nothing to do with anything else, that there is no Āṭmā and nothing like a nexus, between Self and Not-Self—even such a jīva, knowing the U only, is also called mukṭa, free from doubt in his own way. Again, he who declares that Brahman is identical exclusively with pure Negation only, devoid of all and everything, he

---

truth of the universal, that the Self is ever blissful, having *nothing* to do, at any time, being always Full and Complete and Wantless.

[1] Current Samskṛṭ philosophical literature does not recognise the distinctions which follow in the text; it only distinguishes the jīvan-mukṭa, 'one who is free while still in the body,' and videha-mukṭa, the same after the body has fallen away.

also is a mukṭa and his technical designation is vimukṭa; for even though he does not know the element of Eṭaṭ or Samsāra, still he knows it by implication, because he knows the nexus, even though he knows that nexus as the most important; and he also is free from doubt in his own way, having, for the time being, resolved all into Nothing. Finally, he who knows only this, *viz.*, that I am or is Brahman, that the Āṭmā alone is Brahman, and the Anāṭmā nothing—he also is a mukṭa for similar reasons. But the non-recognition of the fact that the Anāṭmā cannot stand without the Āṭmā is the deficiency, the lack of completeness of knowledge (in all these cases, which lack ultimately creates doubts again and destroys the insufficiently grounded freedom therefrom). Free from all such defect is the triune unity-in-separateness of the Self, the Not-Self and the Negation, and he who knows this is the jīviṭa-mukṭa.

It may be questioned how, when the three are declared to be inseparable and triune, is it possible to know any one of them singly and by itself and attain mokṣha thereby. The answer is that because knowledge falls within the law of succession, this appearance of successive knowledge of one only at a time does take place as a fact; and as all the trinity is Brahman, the knowledge of any one may

also not improperly be said to be knowledge of Brahman and so to constitute moksha. The consequence is that all jīvas may be regarded as baḍḍha, bound, all as mukṭa, free, all as siḍḍha, perfect, indifferently and simultaneously[1].

Like the distinctions of jīviṭa-mukṭa, vimukṭa, and mukṭa, there are other dis-

[1] This is only another illustration and application of the fact and law of the continuum, the insepara-bility, of all things and conditions. The ordinary intelligence, 'understanding' as it is called by some of the German philosophers, corresponding to the manas of the *Nyāya* instinctively endeavors to separate, to analyse and divide and distinguish, to grasp only one thing at a time, to cut off objects from each other as with a razor. But this is impossible; there is no such division and separation in the World-process; it is emphatically a conti-nuum; and the buḍḍhi, the reason, recognises this higher fact and synthesises accordingly. The lower mind wishes to tear apart the abstract and the concrete, universal and particular, back and front; it is the very principium of the particular, the concrete, the separate; it is the false self, the self as identified with a this; its one yearning and craving and straining is to delimit, to define, to impatiently and discontentedly and incessantly ask: 'But *what is* the universal, the abstract, the pure Self? I do not recognise what it is; give me something tangible; what you say is mere words,

tinctions too, *e.g.*, mahāṭmā, sāḍhu, yogī, yogeshvara, sānṭa, pravishta, siḍḍha, parama-siḍḍha, etc. These appellations mark definite stages of attainment in an indefinitely progressive series, according to the grade of knowledge, and of cessation from ahaṅkāra, *i.e.*, the personal feeling of initia-

---

mere air!' It will not see that the universal, the abtsract, the pure Self cannot be explained to it in terms of the senses, as 'It is this that you can see and touch and taste, etc.,' without losing its character of universality and abstractness. The reason recognises that such pure Self *is*, as a fact and as a law, indeed as *the* fact of all facts and *the* law of all laws, as the very principle of connexion between all discrete facts; it recognises that universality is present, immanent, in all 'particulars,' that without this inaudible, intangible, invisible, untasteable, unsmellable element of continuity, the audible, the tangible, the visible, the tasteable, the smellable would have no mutual connexion, no coherence, no meaning; it sees that this whole everlasting World-process itself is one continuous, ever-renewed and ever-futile effort to define the abstract Self in terms of the concrete Not-Self. If we thoroughly realise this fact, then such paradoxical-looking statements of the *Praṇava-vāḍa*,—and they are very frequent—as that all jīvas are bound as well as free, that freedom may be gained by realising only one even of the three factors of Brahman, etc., become intelligible.

tion of acts by oneself and the desire for fruit of action, and according to the perfection of the peace and contentment attained.

There are four principal sub-divisions under mokṣha, *viz.*, sālokya, sāyojya[1], sāmīpya, and sārūpya, based on (the nature of the) kriyā (belonging to each). Sālokya is of the nature of samsāra, connected with U; the 'realisation' corresponding to it is, 'with the world', *i. e.*, that there is nothing outside the loka, the world. Sāyojya, again, is knowledge including both the Self and the Not-Self; this samsāra exists, surely, but it does so in 'conjunction' with the Āṭmā; it implies that the Self and the Not-Self, A and U, are both accepted as mutually inseparable from and dependent on each other. As the sālokya-mukṭa, believing in the Anāṭmā only, labours under the defect of not knowing the Self and the Nexus, so the sāyujya-mukṭa, believing in the Self and the Not-self, suffers from the deficiency of not knowing the Nexus. Sārūpya is connected with name and form; with the Self, the Not-Self and the Negation; it is based on the M, on the svarūpa of the AUM, (*i.e*, its *form* and not its real significance).

[1] The spelling in the *Praṇava-vāḍa* is sāyojya, and not sāyujya, as now-a-days. *Bhavishya-Purāṇa*, III, iv,. ch. 7, has the spelling sāyojya.

Sāmīpya,[1] 'nearness', 'approximation,' is the unity of all three. With reference to the transcendental, only an endless *approximation* is possible. It is true that in a certain sense even an atom is mukṭa, is a trinity possessing sālokya, sāyojya, and sāmīpya, and based on the AUM; yet, because the universal AUM is transcendental, the definite and particular atom can make only an incessant and endless approximation to it. Because all are small and all are great comparatively, from the standpoint of Mahā-Vishṇu an atom is only approximate to mukṭī; and so too is Mahā-Vishṇu, from the point of view of another higher being, also only approximately mukṭa. This gradation extends endlessly. Sāmīpya is the true mokṣha; he who has achieved it is the jīviṭa-mukṭa; it is born of perfect achievement, sarva-siḍḍhi-jā.

It is said sometimes that sālokya is the first and sārūpya the last and highest kind of mukṭi; but the true fact is that from the standpoint of samsāra, sālokya comes first; then,

[1] Compare the expression in *The Secret Doctrine* 'the great day, Be-with-us' and the Samskṛṭ word upāsanā, 'sitting near,' 'waiting or attending on,' commonly used to mean worship. See also *Light on the Path*, "It is beyond you, because it for ever recedes. You will enter the light, but you will never touch the flame.'

by recognition of the Self, sayojya, wherein are combined both Self and Nof-Self; and the third is sārūpya which implies that the Self and the Not-Self are 'one-*formed*' or one. From the standpoint of sārūpya, all is 'similarity,' same-formed-ness[1]; all is free and all is bound, etc., and hence, in a way, sārūpya is capable of being regarded as the highest. But beyond that is the sāmīpya which includes all the trinity, *viz.*, the Self and the Not-Self and the Nexus between them. The triune AUM itself is sāmīpya including the other three. The four together are Brahman in which the jīva merges.

'Merged' in Brahman, līna, here means nothing more nor less than the clear realisation that the I is the Other, the Other is the I, and that the I and the Other, in the relation of Negation, are the Supreme; all appearance of separateness being the illusion of imagination, to the removal of which all endeavour is directed, as taught by the shāsṭras.

---

[1] That is to say, the consciousness in this condition is a consciousness which does not make distinction between Self and Not-Self, regarding both as not only inseparable but the same. In this sense it promotes the sense of unity; but—without clear and correct knowledge of the circumstances; the consciousness of unity here is confused, vague, non-discriminative. In the last there is clear knowledge of the unity in diversity.

10

Sāmīpya, as the highest knowledge, is nirguṇa and beyond time, space and motion, while the other three forms of mukṭi are saguṇa and within space, etc. In this highest state only dwell all true brāhmaṇas, etc. It is the fruit of all sciences and all actions; and all actions and all sciences are the fruits of it. In it is no pleasure and no pain, no joy and no sorrow, but ever unsullied purity and the necessity of all things.

The atom of a system regards the Mahā-Viṣhṇu of that system as the limit of achievement. So, too, the Mahā-Viṣhṇu regards some one else, some other being, as such limit. The achievements of such limited goals are called the achievement of sāyojya-mukṭi, freedom of the nature of identification with the being who marks the limit. But sāmīpya is the universal, all-supporting and timeless consciousness expressed by the Logion, that includes all Self and all Other-than-Self.[1]

[1] These remarks help us to understand the element of truth that there also is in the current interpretations of the various kinds of mukṭi. According to these, sālokya means attaining to and residing in the same world as the deity who has been made the ideal and the object of devotion; sāmīpya means constant nearness to and attendance on him; sārūpya is attaining to his form and appearance; while sāyujya is mergence in and identity with

him. Sometimes a fifth kind is added to these four, *viz.*, Sārshti, sameness of powers with the object of devotion. If the law of analogy is true, illustrations should be found in the surroundings of the physical plane familiar to us, of the facts of the subtlest plane that we can think and talk about—for the subtlest planes *are here*, interpenetrating the familiar physical, and are not things far distant and unapproachable. Accordingly, we may endeavour to bring these kinds of deliverance a little nearer home to ourselves by thinking of the case of an ambitious human aspirant who gradually succeeds in (i) obtaining access to the precincts within which the sovereign of his country resides, (ii) becoming one of his court, his entourage, and donning his uniform, (iii) becoming his confidential advisor and co-worker, (iv) becoming one of his family, by marriage, etc., (v) occasionally officiating for him and exercising his functions. If we substitute for the greater mutual resistance and exclusion of physical bodies, the greater intercommunication of subtler ones (—comets' tails are known to science to pass through each other—) ; for the intense egoism of the lower bodies, the greater 'universalism' of the buḍḍhic and higher bodies ; the prevalence of love—such as makes the 'many' billions of separate living cells 'one' single organic individual—over the separativeness, the hate, that breaks up joint families into pieces ; then we may have a fair working idea of what various grades of mokṣha are in the technical 'superphysical' sense, as distinguished from the metaphysical one

of 'freedom from doubt and consequent utter peace of mind'.

The theosophical student will probably be able to trace correspondences between the various 'technical' kinds of m u k ṭ i mentioned here, (*viz.* J i v a n-m u k ṭ i, v i ḍ e h a-m u k ṭ i, vimukṭi, etc., and s a l o k y a, etc., considered independently, or as sub-divisions of j i v a n-m u k ṭ i, etc.) and the various stages of superphysical achievement and existence mentioned in the other religions, *e.g.*, a r h a ṭ, a s e k h a, b u ḍ ḍ h a, p a c h c h e k a-b u ḍ ḍ h a, n i r m ā ṇ a-k ā y a, s a m b h o g a-k ā y a, ḍ h a r m a-k ā y a, etc., in Buḍḍhism; 'glory,' 'beatitude,' etc., in Christianity; m e r ā j in Islām—and so on.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER IV. (*Continued.*) Sub-Section (II.)

THE SACRIFICES MENTIONED IN THE YAJUR-VEḌA.

The significance of various yajñas or sacrifices. —The five daily sacrifices or the pañcha-mahā-yajñas, and the bali-vaishvaḍeva, the bali-praḍāna and the bali-bhūṭa.—Aṣhva-meḍha, gō-meḍha, nara-meḍha, ajā-meḍha and māhi-ṣha-meḍha.—Agni-hoṭra, vājapeya, ḍīk-ṣhā.

This highest or 'spiritual' knowledge is sub-served by, is built upon, the 'action' of sacrifices,[1] expounded in the *Yajuh,* to understand and properly perform which action, again, knowledge

[1] The Samskṛṭ word yaj, to sacrifice, to offer up, to give or devote to the service (of some cause of good), as well as its English equivalent 'sacrifice,' to render sacred, to consecrate to some purpose or to the will of a higher being—seem both to have equally narrowed down in significance in latter days. But there is a tendency arising again to restore them to their original breadth of signi-ficance, to recognise that no work can be done, no living form newly created or nourished and no effete form destroyed without yajña or sacrifice conscious or subconscious, on the part of some individual being of high order or low.

is necessary. Without such knowledge, the objects meant by the words ashva, meḍha, and others, those concerned with 'the five great daily sacrifices,' or with the rites relating to 'the sacrifice for all creatures,' etc., would not be understood rightly. In other words, action depends on knowledge and knowledge on action, and both on desire, all in inseparable relation; and mukṭi by karma alone is impossible, as it is impossible by jñāna alone, or by ichchhā alone. Every sacrifice, karma, should be made and done with knowledge, jñāna, and with universal love, bhakṭi, also.

Ashva means that whereby the jīva approaches, ashyaṭe, comes up to, all beings, *i.e.*, cognition[1]; and meḍha is the *act* of cognising or knowing. The performance of an ashvameḍha is therefore the making, the acquiring, of knowledge for the good of all beings. Hence too are ashvas offered up to the fire. Ashvas are objects, things, word-meanings, born of knowledge (*i. e.*, intellectual objects, ideas, or,

1 Hence the organs, primarily of sensation, the senses, and secondarily of motion or action. In the current *Upaniṣhaṭs* the senses are often referred to as the horses which have to be controlled. The *Bṛhaḍ-āraṇyaka Upaniṣhaṭ* speaks of the uṣhā, the dawn, (the morning-time of life, the period of acquiring knowledge) as the head of the sacrificial horse.

generally, objects of cognition); the offering of them is the pouring of them into the fire of Brahman (*i. e.*, the assigning to them of their proper places in the Svabhāva of Brahman, the interpreting of them in terms of the Absolute). Hence such statements as that such-and-such study brings the fruit of a hundred or a thousand ashva-meḍhas. And thus we see how the ashva-meḍha subserves mokṣha.

The five great daily sacrifices, mahā-yajñas, have a similar significance. It is the ḍharma, the chief duty, of the household life, that the householder should take food himself only after having performed the five great yajñas and made bali, an offering of edibles into the fire. The significance of these five yajñas, generally, is the dealing with all the possible transactions of life with the constant consciousness that all beings are Brahman, that mine and thine are naught, that all belongs to all. Such transactions fall into five kinds: the first is the business, the work, of 'procession,' 'may I become many,' multiplication; the second is the realisation of all these many as being Brahman; the third is the understanding of the necessity for all this; the fourth is the following out, the due performance, of one's own special routine and assigned duty; the fifth if the doing good to all, the service of all, in every possible way. Yajña is 'that which is fit and proper to do,' karṭum-

yogyam. By this fivefold yajña, the fallacy, the heresy, the illusion, of separateness is destroyed gradually. Such is the primary duty of the householder, and hence the need to know the truth of Brahman before entering the household wherein the avoidance, the expiation of the five daily sins, sūnā[1], by the five daily yajñas, is possible and necessary.

[1] The current interpretation of these five daily sacrifices is of course different from the metaphysical one given here. The sins, sūnā, slaughtering-places, are not interpreted in the text; but they may well be supposed to be the opposites of those acts of merit which constitute the sacrifices, acts of exclusiveness, separateness and selfishness. The current view of these daily sins and their expiatory sacrifices is as below: A. (1) sweeping (2) husking (3) grinding (4) cooking and (5) watering, all which operations involve the slaughter of animalcules and insects. B. (1) study (2) hospitality to guests (3) oblations to the departed ancestors (4) offerings to the ḍevas and (5) giving of food to insects and animals. It should be borne in mind that the metaphysical interpretation does not contradict or conflict with the current and literal one, any more than the existence of a general law conflicts with particular instances of its working.

An explanation of them sometimes given is that the first sacrifice, that to the ḍevas, is the recognition of the interdependence between the physical and

Bali-pradāna is the offering up of action. All bali, *i.e.*, action, effort, should be offered up to the Vishvēḍevas, should be regarded as done by the Whole and not by one's own small self.

The ḍevas of the vishva, the world, are all jīvas, *i.e.*, the totality of jīvas, from the atomic to the infinite-seeming. Indeed this host of jīvas is itself called vishva. For such reasons are the five mahā-yajñas, bali-vaishva-ḍeva, and bali-pradāna prescribed for the householder [1]. The distinction between the last two is that the latter of them is directed towards individuals and the former to the all. These five mahā-yajñas commencing with the

---

super-physical worlds, and the rightful co-operation of their inhabitants with each other. The sacrifice to the ṛṣhis is the steady pursuit of study with a view to the teaching of others; that to the piṭṛs is the recognition of the past and the endeavor to hand on the legacy, enriched, to the future; that to men, the feeding of the poor; that to bhūṭas, the kindly tending of animals. Each of these duties should be performed every day, and thus the householder comes into and maintains right relations with his surroundings. (A. B.)

[1] The *Praṇava-vāḍa* seems to regard balivaishvaḍeva and bali-praḍāna as distinct from the five daily sacrifices; modern custom mixes them with the five.

personal and selfish, svārṭha, end in duty for duty's sake, paramārṭha. Hence has it been declared that the service of guests and travellers and worthy yaṭis, brahmachārīs and sannyāsīs, in the five ways, leads gradually from egoism to disinterestedness, and the householder acquires an increasingly generous nobleness of character, abandons all calculations of personal results, and comes to regard the whole world as one family, without distinction of mine and thine; in every 'this' and 'this,' he sees the I, the universal I alone, and not the personal, and thus realises the AUM.

It is true that cognition, desire, action and their summation are only four, while we have five kinds of yajñās; this is because of the aḍhishṭhāna, the substratum.[1]

Cognition, desire and action correspond respectively to bali-vaishvaḍeva, bali-bhūṭa, and bali-praḍāna. The Āṭmā is the first; it is the great ḍeva or Over-lord of all the World-process, and all is for it. The Samsāra is the bali-bhūṭa,[2] the Anāṭmā

[1] The meaning is not clear, but see the paragraph on māhisha-meḍha *infra*.

[2] The bali-bhūṭa, not before mentioned, is probably intended to cover the five mahā-yajñas. The text is far from clear on these points. Just before, it has been stated that bali-praḍāna is the offering up of all action to the Vishveḍevas

that 'binds' with the words, 'me,' 'thee,' and so forth. The Negation is the b a l i-p r a ḍ ā n a, connecting the others together.

These three are the daily sacrifices of the householder, and the steady performance of all duties as subsidiary to them brings unshakable knowledge to him. The a g n i h o ṭ r a-duty is covered by these three. All this world should be offered up, reduced, brought into a g n i which is light, *i.e.*, all the world should be comprehended in the light of B r a h m a n. The 'offering up' is the burning up of personal desire. What has been offered up into the fire, *i.e.*, performed without personal desire, in the light of universal reason, as a matter of duty, reaches all beings, and is for the good of all. In another sense, also, objects cast into the fire assume new forms and reach subtler j ī v a s of other worlds or planes. Transmutation of the forms of objects is one result of all y a j ñ a s. The rites of y a j ñ a, well-performed, reach to and affect the best and subtlest beings; hence the ordainment to offer up the 'most excellent'[1] objects, rice, butter, and so on.

---

which would seem to identify it with b a l i-v a i s h v a ḍ e v a; and in the current view b a l i-b h ū ṭ a is only one of the five great daily sacrifices.

[1] In the hurry and bustle of life where 'familiarity breeds contempt' instead of affection, men's minds grow coarse and callous and superficial,

The five meḍhas or sacrifices, by the performance of which and of agni-hoṭra, etc., the jīva attains to the highest goal, are: the gō-meḍha, the ashva-meḍha, the nara-meḍha, the ajā-meḍha, and the māhiṣha-meḍha.[1] These and the vāja-peya, the agni-hoṭra, and the three karmas or rites of ḍīkshā bring happiness.

---

and lose the finer instincts and more ethereal susceptibilities of the simpler *and deeper* child-nature. To understand the appropriateness of the qualification 'most excellent,' we have to put ourselves in the attitude of the Manu who ordains that the food that nourishes life shall be honored and eaten with reverence. And what things more 'excellent' than milk and butter, the produce of the mother-instinct of the cow, and the food-grains, the produce of the mother-instinct of the Earth. King Midas, of the old Greek story, who regarded gold as the 'most excellent' object, realised his error too late when, under the boon he had craved and received at the hands of the gods, his food was turned to gold at his touch. Those who have suffered from famine know the 'excellence' above all things of the food that gives them life. Also, special articles have special *super-physical* merits and excellences.

[1] These five are known as the naimiṭṭika, or 'for special reason or occasion' in contra-distinction from the five *daily* sacrifices which are known as the niṭya or 'constant,' 'daily.'

Gō-meḍha is the sacrifice of sound (the sanctification of speech); it signifies the giving or making intelligible of gā or speech by the meḍha or intelligence; it is the giving to all of the science of sounds or words. As said before, ashva-meḍha is the accumulation of all knowledge for the use of all. Even the 'deniers,' nāsṭikas, who believe the world to be without an Īshvara and without Āṭmā, who think that whatever is is of itself, and neither was nor shall be, *i.e.*, who confine themselves to the present moment and refuse to trace any causes and motives for anything into the past or the future, even they actively endeavour to impart their opinions to others. For if all this samsāra is self-accomplished and without any cause or motive, what is the use to them of entering into this advisory relation with others? Indeed, they do not act up to their views and thereby prove the fallacy of the latter. They find themselves compelled to recognise relations between things; otherwise all advice, counsel and conversation between human beings, such as they also recognise the validity of and themselves indulge in, would be impossible. It appears thus that ashva-meḍha ought always to be performed; and, indeed, is necessarily and always being performed in greater or lesser degree by every one even without special or conscious effort on his part.

The transcendental consciousness, inherent in everything, 'May I become many,' is always manifesting itself in the fact of the exposition and propagation by every one of his own views for the acceptance of others. Especially is it the duty of kings to perform this sacrifice; for they are the guardians of ḍharma, indeed they exist only to guard it; and their prime duty is to provide for the giving to all of such instruction as will enable each to perform his ḍharma.

Nara-meḍha is the link between the preceding two. Nara is the name for that which is the support and substratum of all, and that is ichchhā which holds together all; therefore the sacrifice which makes fruitful the mutual dependence of the two others is the nara-meḍha.[1]

The go-meḍha corresponds to the A; the ashva-meḍha to the U; the nara-meḍha to the M; and the ajā-meḍha is the samāhāra. When there is born the consciousness that nothing is born and nothing dies then is the ajā-meḍha performed; ajā means etymologically

[1] Compare the theosophical view that desire is predominant on the astral plane which is connected with the āpas-ṭaṭṭva, 'water,' 'parjanya,' 'clouds,' and that our present human consciousness is mostly astral; and Manu's statement that "the waters are called nārāh, and are the abode of him from whom our present life springs and who is therefore called Nārāyaṇa."

the unborn. Thereafter comes the fifth or māhisha-meḍha, which is ever performed by Brahmā and is ever connected with all things.

Brahmā, Vishṇu, Ruḍra, Mahā-Vishṇu and others perform these five yajñas and the world manifests in consequence. They correspond to cognition, desire, action and summation, and, fifthly, the transcendental aḍhishṭhāna, substratum,[1] known as the *Praṇava*. All these

---

[1] If we may hazard a guess as to the meaning of this fifth, it seems to be something like this: however much we may endeavour to define and declare the Absolute in words there always remains behind something which is recognisable only by and in the silence of the sub- or supra-consciousness (for the obvious reason that *the whole* cannot be comprehended by *a part*) ; if we say that the consciousness or the World-process or the Absolute is triple we, as a matter of fact, think only of *a* limited *whole*, *a* system, made up of similarly circumscribed three, and, therefore, we find that there is a fourth also, of the nature of summation; but when we have expressly stated this summation, it becomes, not identical with the totality of the three *but* a fourth, side by side with, besides, and other than the three; and then we have to resort to a fifth as the summation of the four; but if we should expressly state this fifth its fate would be the same and we should have to sub-consciously think of a sixth, and so on.

medhas, yajñas and kriyās are included in Aham-Eṭaṭ-Na. The māhisha-meḍha is included in the Negation, 'there is no fruit to be looked for, nothing to be done, all is born of Svabhāva'. Included in the Not-This together with the Aham is the ajā-meḍha, the summation and the combination of *is* and *is-not*. Included in the Eṭaṭ is the nara-meḍha.[1]

The ashva-meḍha is the combination of I-This and This (?). The I alone, the supreme sound, the Shabḍa-Brahman is the go-meḍha.[2]

Because of this significance of the yajñas is it declared: He who, gaining knowledge,

---

[1] This seems to be put from some other standpoint, as an alternative view, for, just before, nara-meḍha has been connected with ichchhā which corresponds to the Negation.

[2] In the modern view these sacrifices mean, respectively, the bull-sacrifice, the horse-sacrifice, the man-sacrifice, the goat-sacrifice and the buffalo-sacrifice. One allegorical view interprets these as the sacrifices of the various animal passions typified by the various animals, pride, restlessness, selfishness, lust, anger, etc. Another superphysical explanation, brought out in theosophical literature, is that in very exceptional circumstances, a *human* soul happened to have become tied to an animal body, as a punishment, and it was set free by the destruction of that body at one of these sacrifices, by special ceremonial.

giveth it to others, he is the wise man and virtuous, and he knoweth the ḍharma. This imparting of knowledge to others is the first karma. Conduct in accordance with the knowledge gained is the second. The accomplishment of wishes by means of good conduct is the third. There is no conduct, good or bad, no knowledge and no ignorance, all is Brahman, embodied Saṭ-chiṭ-ānanḍa—to realise this is the fourth. The fifth is constant endeavour for the good of all. And all this together is mokṣha. Not to perform these sacrifices is to incur sin, for he who gives not to others the knowledge gained by him, in him the jñāna aspect of the Āṭmā is distressed, narrowed, atrophied, and all his action vitiated. For this same purpose of spreading knowledge do all incarnations take place; and by such yajña-sacrifice alone the world was born, exists, and shall continue.

The significance and purpose of agni-hoṭra, vāja-peya and ḍīkṣhā are similar. Agni-hoṭra, is the offering up, into the fire of Brahman, of what has been acquired, by oneself. In the vāja-peya, while the acquired is offered up, the unacquired is striven after and sought. Ḍīkṣha, initiation, is the connecting together of the agni-hoṭra and the vāja-peya in this relation, *viz.*, that the acquired and the unacquired are all the same in all-time and

all-space, and that Brahman includes all. Ḍīkṣha is the instruction, 'if this is done, such will be the result, this is the right thing to do on this occasion.'

The agni-hoṭra corresponds to the A; vāja-peya to the U; ḍīkṣhā-karma to the M; and the totality of all these is samskāra, initiation, consecration, which corresponds to the summation.

To those in the household, action is the bringer of mokṣha. The five mahā-yajñas and bali-vaishva-ḍeva, etc., are the niṭya-yajña, the constant or daily sacrifices. The five meḍhas and agni-hoṭra, vāja-peya, ḍīkṣhā, etc., are the naimiṭṭika or occasional, performed because of special reason, occasion. He who passes through this high saṁskāra attains Brahman. The former corresponds to A; the latter to U; to M corresponds the a-naimiṭṭa which is neither, but which is the whole of the duty of the system of castes and life-stages that is summed up in the AUM. Samskāra, sacrament, is the cause of differentiation (of physical and superphysical qualifications of special kinds).[1]

[1] This and the next para indicate still another aspect of these initiations, that of 'occult ceremonies' whereby the ranks of the hierarchies, the spiritual rulers and guides of evolution are recruited. There is nothing mystical or even obscure in these matters

Ṛṣhis, maharṣhis, mahāṭmās, brāhmaṇas, yogīs and ḍevas come to yajñās and give teaching according to their power. Such indeed is the fruit of all assemblages of the good, and hence the saying that Bhagavān himself dwells in the 'assembly'. The place of yajña is the place of such gatherings, and such places only are ṭīrṭhas, holy places, for, by going to them and listening to the teachings given and practising them, jīvas 'cross over' (the etymological meaning of ṭīrṭha being a crossing-place, a ford, a ferry) that is to say, pass beyond doubts and illusions.

---

even though they are not public. Their *nature* seems to be the same as that of the preparations, tests and examinations for and installations in various offices in the various departments of the outer physical life of a nation; but the details are of course very different.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER VI. (*Continued*). Sub-Section (III).

THE SACRAMENTS MENTIONED IN THE YAJUR-VEḌA.

The significance of the samskāras or sacraments.—Their dual aspect, conventional, unreal or formal, and real or metaphysical.—The supreme importance of upa-nayana.—The symbolical meaning of certain ceremonial articles connected with brahma-charya.—The sixteen samskāras.

Thus we see that action bases itself on and is connected with cognition, and hence the ordinance that sacrifices should be performed after completing brahma-charya. It is true that morning and evening havana, offering into the fire, is ordained during brahma-charya also, but it has a special significance, there. The *Smṛṭi*-verse says: Having got together the fuel of samiṭ or palāsha (different kinds of wood) let him raise the fire, 'morning and evening.' Here samiṭ and palāsha signify only study and the revision of the lessons. Samiṭ indicates knowledge generally; palāsha means the same with reference to practical application and action; agni is desire; the three correspond to the primal Trinity. Mutual discussion, the voluntary exposition of their special subjects

to each other, by students, is havana. The 'mornings and evenings,' are the proper time for study.

When brahma-charya has been completed successfully the desire for selfish results disappears. Hence the placing of the household life after it. Only in this wise, joy and sorrow being both seen to be naught, can the work of Brahman, duty, be performed steadfastly.

The begging for food enjoined upon brahmachāris has also for object the removal of all false sense of pride and humiliation, and the realisation of all as Self.[1]

Because both knowledge and action are means to mokṣha, therefore is samskāra, consecration, initiation, needed for all persons. Without such sacrament the realisation of Brahman cannot be accomplished. The rules as to caste, etc., are all connected with samskāra. There are two primary divisions of caste, ḍvi-ja, twice-born, and a-ḍvi-ja, non twice-born. The latter is the shūḍra, the servant of all beings. The

[1] And also, we may perhaps add, the circulation of a constant current of affection between the householders as a body and the students, their own children, as a body; an ideal and idyllic condition of the truest and highest socialism where anybody's child would be treated in any and every house as a child of *that* house, when he comes hungry, asking for food.

former is he who has been born from or by means of two kinds of sacrament[1]. This class is sub-divided into brāhmaṇa, kṣhaṭṭriya and vaishya by correspondence to A, U, and M. The two kinds of consecration are the saṭya, true or real, and the asaṭya, false or apparent and conventional. The true consecration is connected with the knowledge of Brahman; the conventional one with the work, activity, or external forms and appearances and manifestations of Brahman. Above both is the third, *viz.*, the asamskṛṭa, the unconsecrated or beyond consecration.

The true consecration is the conjunction, the harmonious mergence and union, of cognition and action, which is possible only when all three, *viz.*, karma, jñāna, and bhakṭi[2] have been gained, and are evenly combined. But the gain of one only of these is also a sacrament, and that is a conventional one.

---

[1] The current interpretation of ḍvi-ja is 'born a second time' by means of the sacrament of upanayana, the 'leading up' to the Teacher, (ultimately to Brahman, by means of the baptism of fire, the fire of heart-searching and world-searching, the fire of pain and sorrow out of which arises the introspective consciousness, the true second birth).

[2] These words may perhaps be translated briefly and conveniently, by gnosis, pistis and energism (see Baldwin's *Dictionary of Philosophy*).

The nature of the birth and origin of all beings in one and the same, *viz.*, a conjunction of Puruṣha and Prakṛṭi, Self and Not-Self, because of mutual desire. These beings are sub-divided into four kinds, minerals, vegetables, animals, and humans, corresponding to cognition, desire, action and the summation. These four are connected with sṭhūla or dense matter and are perceivable by the physical senses. *Before* and *after* these four, too, extends an endless series, in correspondence with the rule of four; and *within* these four, again, are endless atoms, and a tetrad within each atom. All is thus transcendental and infinite, and, in this view, we see at once that all is relative and similar in respect of all action, *i.e.*, of becoming or birth, stay, death, rebirth, etc.

All men are thus the same in birth; but their work is different and differentiates them in accordance with the predominance of cognition, or desire, or action, the fourth or summation, being the service of all, shūḍra-hood.

He who simply serves all beings is the shūḍra; he has no clear knowledge, either of the relation of action and desire or of the summation. (This is the first stage). Of these shūḍras, he who begins to slightly know the Self, the Not-Self and the Negation, his consciousness begins to turn inwards from outwards; for and by means of this he restrains the

activity of the senses and strives after self-control, sva-vashī-karaṇa, and thus attains vaishya-hood. This inward-turning of the consciousness is the true consecration. The unreal consecration, on the other hand, is the outer imitation thereof by taking up brahmacharya and its duties, *viz.*, the study of the inner or subjective and other sciences, whereby fitness for the true consecration is gained. In the condition of the shūḍra, to serve for personal gain is the *imitation* of the true service which is devoid of all expectation of return, and so constitutes a-saṭ-shūḍra-ṭva, false shūḍra-hood; whereas service based on the consciousness that all is produced from the one, even though it be external service with the immediate attention directed outward and the senses active, makes saṭ-shūḍra-ṭva, true or good shūḍra-hood.[1] So the mere imitation,

[1] It must be clear to the reader and should be borne in mind that the words saṭ and asaṭ, real and unreal, true and false, have a technical sense in this work, and that the second has no disparaging or condemnatory implication. They correspond with metaphysical and physical, ideal and real, transcendental and empirical, abstract and concrete, principle and practice, theory and embodiment, rule and illustration, homogenous and heterogenous, generalisation and differentiation, universal and particular, law and instance.

the outer form, of the saṭ or true vaishya, is the asaṭ or conventional vaishya who carries on trade and business generally. The accomplishment of the work of Brahman by means of that trade, for the sake of oneself, of others and of duty, is the mark of the saṭ vaishya. In the case of the kṣhaṭṭriya, kṣahṭṭra is the destruction of vice and the promotion of virtue, it is the upholding of ḍharma and the guarding of it for the good of oneself and of all others, because all are One. This is the work of the saṭ kṣhaṭṭriya. Its outer or formal imitation in the conventional relations, vyavahāra, behaviour, of king and subject, the protection of the subject, the establishment of laws, maryāḍā, bounds, limits, conventions, is the work of the asaṭ or conventional kṣhaṭṭriya. Finally, the knowledge of Brahman in its triunity is the quality of the saḍ brāhmaṇa; while the formal imitation thereof, the work of the asaḍ brāhmaṇa, is the sixfold activity of sacrificing and helping others to sacrifice, study and teaching, and giving and receiving of gifts, all done with the ultimate object of attaining to the saṭ. The person who has the right to perform the seventh karma is neither the brāhmaṇa, nor the kṣhaṭṭriya, nor the vaishya, nor the shūḍra; that karma is the performance of the other six without selfish desire for personal results. The sub-division of

cognition, action and desire by two (*i. e.*, cognition and action?) gives the six; while the totality of them is the seventh.

This inward turning of the consciousness, then, is the second or saṭya, true and real, samskāra, which brings about the second birth, or birth by means of the samskāras.

The upa-nayana (literally, leading up or guiding, and conventionally investiture with the sacred thread) is the chief of all sacraments. It can be accomplished only with the help of a saḍ-guru, a true preceptor. When the understanding arises in the jīva that the whole of Samsāra is an inseparable compound of pleasure and pain, that pleasure can never be secured in the world unalloyed with and unmarred by pain, then is the proper time for this consecration. 'The maker of all this is Īshvara; I am the Āṭmā; all is composed of Brahman; and Brahman is ānanḍa itself qualified by saṭ and chiṭ. How and why then is there all this doubt and illusion in this world, and this perplexing rotation of birth, life and death; how pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow, love and hate? What and where is the law and order in all this? How and from what does all this arise?' When such reflections arise in the jīva then he seeks out his saḍguru and obtains knowledge from him and becomes an upanīṭa, 'the guided, the brought up, the initiated.' The obtaining of exact

knowledge of the Three in their unity and diversity alone constitutes the true upa-nayana.

The formal and external representation of this is the conventional ceremony, known as upavīṭa, also called the vraṭa-banḍha, 'the binding on or taking up of the vow,' for from that time begins the observance of the vow of brahma-charya, which means study of the subjective sciences. All rejoice on the occasion, for the possibility of 'earning' or gaining Brahman comes near to them all at the time. They are glad that this boy, their relative, becomes a brahma-chārī, a 'walker' in Brahman, does everything as directed by his āchārya,[1] guide and preceptor, and with him studies this supreme science.

The outer mark of the ceremony is the putting on of the thread. But the real triple thread is the trinity of cognition, desire and action. A yajña or sacrifice is performed on the occasion, for the successful accomplishment of the study and the removal of all hindrances thereto, and the ḍevas of this world and ṛṣhis, maharṣhis,

---

[1] आचिनोति च शास्त्रार्थानन्यानाचारयत्यपि ।
स्वयमाचरते चैव तस्मादाचार्य उच्यते ॥

"Because he 'gathers together' the essential teachings of all true sciences, because he 'induces others to act' according to them, because he himself 'lives them'—therefore is he given the honored name of āchārya".

brāhmaṇas, yogīs and other high beings are invoked and invited to it as witnesses of the ceremony; and all the assembled people pray to them: 'Do ye help in the fulfilment of this vow of brahma-charya, let this jīva's innermost desire turn to the study of the truth of Brahman.' And the father and the mother of the boy, having placed the sign and symbol of the thread upon him and taught him his new duties, send him away with the āchārya: 'Go willingly and gladly, O beloved! and obey him in all things; study the science of Brahman, learn the truth, become Brahman and then return and happily engage in the work of this Samsāra.'

In accordance with the rule of cognition, desire and action (?) it is proper for the boy to maintain his connection with his family for an ahna[1], a week, after the ceremony, and then he follows the āchārya to learn the *Veḍa* with its *Aṅgas* and *Upāṅgas*, and all the laws of the World-process.

This inward-turned consciousness belongs to the three varṇas, 'colors,' castes, only; hence they only have the right to the upa-vīṭa. He who has

[1] *Ahna* seems to be used for a week, in this work, instead of a day, which seems to be the modern interpretation of the word; or perhaps there is a difference between the old *ahnah* and the modern *ahah* and *ahan*.

not the intelligence that can perform introspection and grasp subjective things, he is outside the pale of ḍvi-ja-ṭva, twice-born-ness. Paramparā, heredity, has also a place in this reference. Vaishyas, kṣhaṭṭriyas and brāhmaṇas have the subjective consciousness by heredity. Those whose constant work is the inward-turning of the consciousness—the work of those born among such will also be similar; and, as all the world knows, the birth of every one is guided by his previous karma. As his karma has been, so is the man's family, business, wealth, race, country, pleasure, pain, etc., and also his caste. It is true that many have only the wish to be born in a higher caste and perform just enough karma to secure this. But they have not the power to do the duties of the caste. Yet, having been born there, they get the teachings that belong to and are current in that caste and so secure the wanting faculties in later births.

This division into castes and stages, these sacraments and sacrifices, belong, under different names and forms, to all times and all places. Analogies to them exist even amongst minerals and vegetables in subtle ways. They are only prominent amongst the humans, and this is so because these are the highest of the 'gross' kingdom, (*i. e.*, the physical plane).

Those, then, who have been consecrated and initiated duly, according to law, acquire the

right to the subjective sciences. If the subjective or introspective bent appears in the s h ū ḍ r a he becomes a ḍ v i-j a. On the other hand, he who never gains this inward-consciousness and never turns to the inner sciences, he falls from the estate of the twice-born, though born as one. In this ever-crumbling S a m s ā r a, composed of pleasure and pain, to be dejected over death and elated over birth, to exult over gains and wail under losses, is the meanest way of living; and not to know the simple truth about the All is to be truly fallen. Otherwise, indeed, from the standpoint of the Absolute, there is no misery and no glory.

For such reasons are directions given for the consecration of the three castes according to the subtle laws that govern their length of life, mental, physical, and superphysical powers, constitutional functions and activity, etc. If the initiation does not take place before a particular age is reached, the j ī v a 'falls' because he has no further opportunity of being able to secure the subjective or introspective consciousness in this life.[1]

Therefore have times, places, and ages been fixed for the consecration of the three castes respectively by the Elders of our race.

---

[1] The matter of the brain-cells 'sets,' so to say, as bones and muscles set and cannot be manipulated unless trained in the early years of life.

Consecration by sixteen sacraments, each sub-divided into s a ṭ and a s a ṭ, real and formal, is in this wise laid down for the three castes. The three factors of the Logion, and their summation, multiplied by themselves,[1] yield the sixteen. The times prescribed for their performance are based upon the ordinary length of human life. It is true that some die in infancy, others in childhood or in youth, and there is no period fixed unchangeably for the span of human life; still, in a general way, the length thereof is determined for and by each epochs; thus, each particular y u g a or m a n v a n ṭ a r a has its own normal and healthy span of life for its living creatures. Those who fall away from the laws of ā c h ā r a, right conduct, fall under other laws and are dealt with specially. The consecrations are based on what is common to the majority. As already indicated, the sub-divisions of real and formal or conventional sacraments correspond to cognition and action, respectively, desire being the hidden nexus. By permutations and combinations of these we get indeed an endless number of sacraments and they are all described as k a r m a, k r i y ā, action and ritual, and are therefore dealt with in the *Yajur-veḍa*, but sixteen are the more important.

[1] That is to say, each being sub-divided into four reflexions of the orginal four, like the *Veḍas*.

The passing through these sacraments is regarded as ḍharma, duty. Ordinarily they belong to the three castes, as said, but if a shūḍra should attain to the inward consciousness by means of service of others, then he too acquires a full right to be taken through all these sacraments by a saḍ-guru, a 'true' teacher. As has been said: 'On completing service all enter into the three castes. Serve all beings by thought, word and deed. So only, gradually, is the status of the vaishya gained, then that of the kṣhaṭṭriya, and lastly that of the brāhmaṇa. Finally, becoming Brahman, the jīva can create new worlds. Briefly, the object and result of all these sacraments is the achievement of the consciousness that the all is I and the I is all.'

The *Veḍas* mention the sixteen samskāras, but the *Smṛṭis* only ten; this is because ten are primary and the remaining six secondary.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER VI. (*Continued.*) Sub-Section (IV).

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE YAJUR-VEḌA.

The various s a m s k ā r a s.—Implantation of the seed of the body.—2. Invocation of the j ī v a to inhabit it.—3. Humanisation of both.—4. Bringing to birth and outer manifestation.—5. Assignment of characteristic name.—6. Dressing up and preparing for future work.—7. Determination of specific vocation and outer marking of it.

(*a*) The first sacrament is the g a r b h-ā ḍ h-ā n a, 'the planting of the seed,' the conception. When k ā m a, love, desire, arises in the woman, then the r a j a s, menstrual flux, appears. It recurs every month, hence is called the ṛ ṭ u, season, and hence also the word ṛ ṭ u-m a ṭ ī for woman. Four days is the period thereof and therein union should be avoided; thereafter the eagerness, the culmination, of desire comes to the woman, and union is permitted. The embryo arises from the conjunction of the v ī r y a, seed or sperm, and the r a j a s, ovum or germ. The establishment of the embryo is accompanied by a sacrament, a consecration. The condition of a woman carrying a fœtus is different from her ordinary condition, even as the case is with plants when in flower before fruiting. The

12

fruiting is a sacrament, a samskāra; therein manyness is achieved. Women are the means of this achievement. All this relates to the sacrament of garbh-āḍhāna, which is needed to secure the due retention and development of the fœtus.

The real, inner, consecration, (the metaphysical or subjective idea underlying the external formalities of the rite), the saḍ-garbh-āḍhāna is the beginning of reflexion about Brahman, 'Who am I, and whence am I?' (It is the planting of the seed of introspective self-consciousness, out of which, as one among other consequences, will grow and develop the inner, subtler body).

(*b*) The second is the sīmanṭ-onnayana. Growth begins in the embryo from the very moment of conception. The time of the completion of this growth, of its full filling out with the atoms of the seed and the ovum, and of the clear definition of trunk and limbs and organs, is the time for this sacrament. It is the time when the jīva comes and enters into the embryonic body.[1] The entrance of the jīva

[1] The permanent atom enters the seminal fluid and attaches itself to a spermatozoon; the physical sheath of the thread to which the atom is attached, connecting it with the higher atoms, is completed in the fourth month, and with this there is a flow of life downwards from the jīva, and

subsequently to the formation of the body is declared everywhere. The body is formed by the multiplication of the compounded atoms of germ and sperm, because each such atom is a trinity and possesses the power of multiplication which manifests everywhere in the World-process; and thereafter some one jīvāṭmā which is connected with the atoms of the body in the womb, comes and enters into it. For the joy of that coming and for the assuring of the jīva's connexion with and stay in the body is this rite performed. The sīmā, limit of ('mechanical') growth, of the body comes to its anṭa, end, then; and unnayana, upleading, bringing up, is the fixing of the connexion between the jīva and the body,[1] (the

'quickening' occurs. I think this is what is meant by "the jīva comes and enters, etc." Until this sheath round the connecting thread is formed, the jīva cannot reach the fœtus. After that there is free communication between the growing fœtus and the astral and mental bodies. Up to this stage, the vegetative and animal processes might have gone on 'mechanically,' *i.e.*, without the presence of a permanent atom, but if that is absent, miscarriage before or at this time *must* occur. (A. B.)

[1] The modern and current interpretation of the word is that sīmanṭa is the 'the parting in the middle of the tresses of a woman,' and unnayana is the arranging, dressing or braiding *up* thereof; and,

'taking up' of the body by the jīva itself).

as a matter of fact, this toilette forms the chief item in the ceremony as it is performed in India, now-a-days.

The remarks in the text are very interesting and suggestive in the light of modern embryology and the theosophical and Veḍānṭic views and discussions as to the exact relation between the jīva and the embryo. One view is that the jīva enters into the matrix *together with* the paternal sperm with which it is *already* connected; another, that it enters the embryo at the moment of conception; a third that it comes to occupy it later on, but while it is still in the womb, *e.g.*, *Manu Samhiṭā* gives the seventh month, (when, medically, the child becomes viable); a fourth that it does not enter the body *fully* till the seventh year after birth, and so on. The view stated here seems, with a little explanation, to reconcile all these various views. The jīva *enters* into the embryo when it is fully formed, as a master *begins* to *live* in a new house only after it has been completed by the builders; but the master is *in relation* with the house from the *earliest* diggings of its foundations and initiates its commencement, and the builders build it according to his needs and wishes and under his direct or indirect supervision and guidance. (See note on p. 178 *supra*). Even so the super-physical 'builders' build each body in accordance with the needs of the karma of each jīva, from the moment of conception. Indeed, in view of the fact that the World-process is an unbroken continuum everywhere, this relation of

The true sacrament here is the completion, the

---

the jīva to its physical envelopes may be traceable in an indefinite regression and progression before and after any particular conception through progenital cells and particles of matter, (the germplasm) into all the kingdoms, animal, vegetable, mineral, elemental, etc. The theories which say that the physical attraction which brings together two beings of opposite sexes is the action of a soul seeking birth, the pretty mythos that makes Cupid a little child shooting arrows of love to bring together youth and maiden, also find explanation in the light of this interpretation; a jīva seeking birth influences the coming together of the parents. (See *Bhavishya-Purāṇa*, Pt. III, kh-iv, ch-xiv. 30-31, where this view is stated almost in so many words).

The Veḍānṭic statement is that the jīva that is still subject to rebirth goes to the moon, Chanḍramā or Soma, ("the gate of Svarga" in and out of which the jīva goes and comes, see the *Chhānḍogya*,) after quitting its physical tenement on this earth (those going to the Sun not being liable to rebirth); and that when the time for its rebirth arrives it descends to the earth by means of parjanya, clouds, through the good offices of Varuṇa, the ruler of the water-world; that the drop of rain to which the jīva is attached enters into a cereal, and the jīva finally passes into the paternal human parent attached to a food-grain and thence into the womb of the maternal parent attached to the sperm. The theosophical allegorical explanation of this is that the Soma-

perfection, of the consciousness of the I and world is the lower mental plane and the Varuṇa-world, the astral plane, and that the redescending jīva first re-creates for itself a mental body and an astral body (by means of the faculties stored in its kāraṇa-sharīra, which practically constitutes its higher self and to a varying extent influences the builders, the nature-spirits, in their work of building up these lower bodies); and that a nature-spirit finally shapes the embryo in the womb according to its needs and deserts as embodied in a 'form' provided by the agents of the karmic law. Of course this allegorical explanation is very illuminative. But there *is no inconsistency* between it and the literal interpretation. The latter seems no doubt very fanciful at first sight; but let us look again, a second time, and we may see better. Compare the following extract, from an up-to-date modern book of science, *The Story of Animal life*, by D. Lindsay (1902 A. D.) "The history of the Liver-fluke is a most complicated example of alternation of generations. The adult form infests the sheep's liver. There it produces eggs, which afterwards find their way into water. Here they die unless they find their way into a certain water-snail, which many of them do. Within this snail--*linnœa truncatula*--the egg developes into a sac-like body, called a sporocyst. This produces within itself numbers of a small creature which is called the Redia form. These in turn produce a tailed form, called a Cercaria, which gets out of the snail, swims in water, and finally settles down on some plant. Here it is eaten by an unfortu-

of the fact that the I is the Ā ṭ m ā, connected

---

nate sheep, within which it developes into the adult fluke" (p.75). The history of the seventeen-year locust is even more astonishing. Which of the these stories is the more fanciful? Indeed the student of science, and, more so, of metaphysic must always be prepared to meet without surprise and with a sympathetic smile the perpetration of the most fanciful conceits and far-fetched jokes by that great amusement-seeker and inveterate pastime-hunter, the Self, in concert with His life-long and equally facetious and sport-loving companion and playmate, Prakṛṭi, the Not-Self. In this particular case indeed, there is much reason to believe that the physical moon, which has in past time contributed to the population of this earth by sending lunar piṭṛs (micro-organisms) to inhabit it, is still connected in some way or other with our mental plane, and so the clouds and waters with our astral plane, for, after all, these planes are material and so in space and time. Thus may both these interpretations be regarded as quite consistent with our text here.

Development by cell-multiplication seems also to be alluded to in the text, and in a way which, while not contradicting the latest views as to specialised sperm and germ cells, indicates that those views should not be emphasised too much and exaggerated; each atom has the power of multiplying and reproducing itself inherent within it, and though division of labour is a patent fact in nature it is

with the A and distinct from space, time, and substance.

---

also not infrequent for a person brought up in one occupation to take up another, at a pinch. By a due combination of these two facts observable in every department of the world-process, a real *continuum* underlying an apparent separateness, the one and the many, in consequence of which 'all exists everywhere,' we can generally successfully appraise the value of and locate the amount of truth present in each of two conflicting hypotheses that may be put forward in connexion with any series of observed facts. Thus, in the conflict of opinion as regards the transmission of acquired characters, between Darwinism and Weismannism, the solution would lie in the *degree* of acquisition. Where, in an abnormal individual, the consciousness has, so to say, run away from his sex-side to develop lop-sidedly his music-side or painting-side, or poetry-side, there the germ-cells cannot be sufficiently modified to reproduce the faculty for music, painting, etc. But if the two sides, *viz.*, the sex-feeling and the special genius-faculty were normally connected by and in the ensouling consciousness, as arms and legs and trunk and senses are, they too would be as unfailingly reproduced as these. The intelligence of an ordinarily well-educated European would amount to abnormal genius in a race of primitive savages; and if one of the latter should develop it in some way, his consciousness would have to be so turned aside from nourishing the sex-nature that he would probably fail to transmit it to any physical progeny

(c) The third sacrament is the p u m-

his bodily instincts and passions may (if at all) produce; but the capacity, the power, of developing that amount of intelligence is normally reproduced in Europe because a higher general level has been reached and a *sufficient amount* of consciousness is available for the even nourishment of both sides. On this point the following statement of Weismann himself, in his latest and maturest work, is worth considering: "Potentially the first Biophorids contained an absolutely inexhaustible wealth of forms of life, and not merely those which have actually been evolved." (*The Evolution Theory*, vol. II. pp. 390, 391). The statement may help to bring out the significance of the metaphysical paradox that all exists everywhere and also to show that Weismann's insistence on the non-transmissibility of acquired characters is self-contradictory, except in a very restricted and special sense, for, indeed, there is no real acquiring of any absolutely new characters in any case, but only an unfoldment of something which was already and always potentially present, and only *seems* new because newly *unfolded*.

In theosophical language, a reconciliation between the different views, mentioned at p. 180, may perhaps be effected by saying that the various permanent atoms, physical, astral, mental etc., (see Annie Besant's *A Study in Consciousness*, I. iv.) corresponding to the various bodies, enter or make connexion with or take possession of their living sheaths, at different successive stages, more and more fully; there being a parallel weaning from or 'birth' out of parental envelopment and

savana, the 'human birth.'[1] After the stay of the jīva has been assured, this rite is performed, and it helps to make known all the conditions and stages that the jīva passes

protection, (in and by means of the various parental bodies, physical, etheric, astral, etc.) at each such step. These periodic crises (see *The Science of the Emotions*, p. 2, footnote) may be regarded as forming a continuous series of comparative 'movings in' and 'movings out,' in terms of the different planes; and may be said to be observable in the various grades of superphysical achievement and technical mukṭi, in yoga-progress also. Thus for a human yogī to become able to function beyond the limits of 'the sphere of influence,' 'the aura,' 'the gravitation-periphery' of the Earth would be like an infant's developing sufficient muscle-power and mental self-reliance to be able to crawl out from the protecting arms, wishes, thoughts of the parents. In the terms of the illustration of the house, we may say that the master continues to enter into possession of it ever more and more fully, from its very inception, by means of various agents, architects, builders, servants, etc., step by step; and even after he has begun to occupy it with his physical body, continues to be 'settled' in it more and more, for long.

[1] The modern interpretation is 'the bringing forth of a *male* child.' Also, it now-a-days *precedes* sīmanṭa, in the families where it is observed, at all. [Sex is determined before the seventh month. A. B.]

through. Briefly, the jīva passes through, in that one womb, an 'imitation' of what it passed through in every 'womb,' (matrix, type, kingdom) that it has ever experienced before; the embryo is transformed and evolved and the body formed in the order of all the 'wombs,' kingdoms, types, wherein the jīva has dwelt in the past. Thus, when a jīva has passed from the vegetable to the animal kingdom, in becoming born as an animal it first developes the 'genus and the individuality' or the form of a plant and then receives the impress of animality in the uterus. This is observable everywhere. Hence after the sīmanṭonnayana is mentioned the 'imitation' by the fœtus, while the body is still forming, of all its previous 'wombs'. This 'imitation' takes place again (a second time, as regards the inner, mental, characteristics?) after the coming in of the jīva, hence the corresponding sacrament of pum-savana[1].

[1] This is a statement of the newly re-discovered facts of ontogeny, palingeny and phylogeny. The modern ceremony is directed to bringing about that the child to be born shall be a male child. The text seems to indicate that the aim of the rite is to make sure that the embryo, in the course of its biogenetic recapitulation, shall arrive at the full human stage and not stop short at an earlier one and so be born as an atavistic monstrosity.

The real sacrament here is the conjunction of the I with the This, (and the definite subordination of the lower self to the Higher Self).

(*d*) The fourth is j ā ṭ a-k a r m a, the 'birth-rite.' It is the accompaniment of the success of the wish, 'May I be many,' which was formed at the time of the union of the man and the woman. This rite is performed for the maintenance of that success. All action being threefold, *viz.*, birth, stay, and death, the endeavour to secure stay naturally follows after the birth.

In the corresponding true consecration the idea is 'What is This; what accrues to the I by that which This is?' (*i.e.*, the endeavour to realise in life and surroundings, to make manifest, the reign of the Higher Self and its benefits.)

(*e*) The fifth is the n ā m a-k a r a ṇ a, the naming. It is true that B r a h m a n is one, yet separateness appears therein and those that appear separate have separate names also, fitly. In truth however all names belong to all.

The true naming is the thinking of the This by the I and of the I by the This—mutual cognition of subject and object, so to say. The name given to an object depends upon the nature of the cognition connected therewith, for cognition and sound are correlated. He who knows or cognises anything, invents a name for it. Words, sounds, names, are necessary for

the accomplishment of the desire connected with cognition. To frame sounds on the basis of that knowledge is to give names whereby things are recognised. Thus, by the utterance of the word A h a m, such a cognition connected or concerned with A, by the utterance of E ṭ a ṭ, such another connected with U, is understood. E ṭ a ṭ is included in A h a m and A h a m in Eṭaṭ; this is the underlying principle here. If the two were not so included within each other, there would be neither I nor This.[1] (In other words, the metaphysical counterpart of the sacrament is the naming, the translation, the understanding of the World-process by the I in terms of Itself and *vice versa*).[2]

---

[1] More on the connexion of language and thought will be found later on in dealing with *Vyākaraṇa* or grammar. (See Sec. III, Chapter XIII, *infra*).

[2] The following note was sent to me by my good friend, Mr. E. H. Bellairs :— . . . In this connexion it is interesting to compare Prof. Adamson's excellent exposition of Fichte. He says (p. 172). "The very characteristic of the Ego, its reflexion upon itself as a definite somewhat, is possible only under the condition that it limits itself through an opposite"—(E. H. B.)

As said in *The Science of Peace*, Fichte, of all western philosophers, is the most helpful preparation for the student of metaphysic, at least as

(*f*) The sixth is the chūḍā-karaṇa, the hair-dressing or 'lock-making.' It signifies the assignment of a work, a duty, to the jīva that has been born. What is the purpose of a jīva being born? To accomplish the work of the World-process. This rite is performed to indicate the fact that henceforward this jīva also engages in work. The kṣhaura-karma, 'shaving-act,' etc., signifies that the work of the world should be taken up after removing the hair and the nails that were formed in the

---

expounded in the *Veḍānṭa*, and in such works as this. For he endeavours to understand the World-process in terms of Ego and Non-Ego, Self and Not-Self, and comes nearest to the final solution as presented here.

Adamson's *Fichte* (Blackwood's *Philosophical Classics*) is invaluable for students who cannot read German; and pp. 153-188, especially, expound his main theses, referred to at p. 66, of *The Science of Peace*. The sentence quoted by Mr. Bellairs is the explanation of Fichte's rather obscure proposition that Ego in part=Non-Ego, and Non-Ego in part=Ego. But withal, after having struggled with Fichte, when the student comes to the Indian terminology, he will probably feel that from struggling with air he has 'come home to rest' and then, if he goes back to Fichte, he will understand him much better. Thus the proposition above referred to *means* that the soul puts on a body and *vice versa*.

uterus. They grow anew. Such is the result of the procession. That which is born, perishes, and *vice versa.* After the removal of the hair, etc., the jīva is dressed in clothes and ornaments, and his egoism, his sense of individuality, grows thereby.

The 'real' consecration implies the union of I and This, 'I *am* This'—the (higher) egoism (or Universalism) of the I permeates the This fully, the entrance into the world and the worldly life (for self-sacrifice) is complete. The sense of I-ness and 'mineness' ('*all* is mine') grows. 'I am this, thus; there is none else; I alone am what I am'. The full cognition of the I and the This and the going forwards of the I into the This—such is the essence of chūḍā-karaṇa. The loss of its original character (of self-ness) by the I and its complete absorption into the This, the envelopment of the former by the latter, is the real dressing, 'toilette' or make-up.

In imitation thereof the hair and nails are removed in the formal rite and the dress of the world is put on. As the babe grows into the child, his freedom from conventions disappears and his sense of shame, etc., grows. In infancy, there is entire freedom; the infant knows not himself, nor another, *i.e.*, he does not know himself as distinguished from another; all is composed of Self to him, as may be seen in the

behaviour of infants. (The distinguishing of others from oneself, of *meum* and *tuum*, the recognition of jīvas other than oneself, is absent in the earliest child-life; that there are others and others' goods to be respected and refrained from is a later idea; the moon is reached for, others' fruits and sweets are seized in the most natural way, living men and women are criticised and appraised to their faces like inanimate toys or animals, clothes are deemed unnecessary, '*I am* the monarch of all I survey,' is the natural attitude; for only *oneself*, in imitation of the One Self, is felt and all other living and so-called non-living things and beings are lumped up as the Not-Self; *many* selves and many not-selves are not realised.)

(*g*) The seventh is the karṇa-veḍha, the 'ear-boring'. Knowledge of all activity is implied hereby, (karṇa, ear, the instrument of hearing and learning, being also connected by archaic etymology with karaṇa, doing, action, activity); it means the veḍha, or cutting, piercing, separation or division of self and others with reference to differentiating action. The consciousness is, 'all this is mine, all else, *i.e.*, that which is not mine is useless; this Samsāra is the chief fact, and neither the Āṭmā nor the Paramāṭmā. The affirmation of and entrance upon activity is thus the karṇa-veḍha sacrament, and the joy of action belongs to it.

The true sacrament signifies: '*This* and not I; I am (or the Aham is) nothing; that which is is This only; I am born from This.' Such is the belief, view, or knowledge that marks this sacrament. Only after having understood this Samsāra exactly and fully does the need for another (*i.e.*, the Self) arise. Hence the need for the sacrament.

The external representation thereof is the piercing of the ear and the putting on of ear-rings, signifying that there are gems and gold and many other precious things in the world which should be acquired and possessed and enjoyed henceforwards. The sense of mineness increases further thereby.

In the real consecration, knowledge of the whole of This is secured to the effect that all the This is composed of pleasure and pain and that the sense of mineness persists notwithstanding this unavoidable alloy of pain.[1]

---

[1] Karṇa-veḍha is here practically interpreted as equivalent to karaṇa-bheḍa, division of labour, differentiation of occupations or functions. The physiological benefits of ear-boring are not made clear, nor *why* this particular act should mark the separation of occupation. Possibly different kinds of ear-rings might have been used in the early days, like different kinds of 'sacred thread,' to mark such differences of professions and castes, the ear-rings being preliminary to and less final though

more prominent than the 'thread'; both these distinctions, in ear-ring and in thread, have now disappeared. There is also a vague tradition in the land that the operation has certain beneficial effects on physical health, something like vaccination without its inseparable ill effects, for there is no virus injected, and the piercing is, or at least ought to be, done with a needle of gold.

APPENDIX TO SECTION III.

CHAPTER VI. Sub-Section iv.

BY

DR. LOUISE APPEL.

SAMSKĀRAS.

From the explanation given in the text it is clear that the samskāras are intended to be performed at certain definite periods or stages in the formation and course of development of the human body, with the view of bringing about certain results that are beneficial to the growing organism. The first three samskāras described by the author have reference to events in ante-natal life, and when studied in the light of modern medical knowledge the results sought to be attained by the samskāras are recognised as eminently desirable ones; indeed medical science to-day seeks to reach the same results but uses for this purpose the physical methods of modern western science, whereas in the samskāras the superphysical (psychic or occult or metaphysical and subjective) methods of ancient eastern science are employed.

Each of these two methods has its own particular value, the western physical method, belonging to an age of materiality, being perhaps the

more universally applicable at the present day, though the eastern superphysical method, belonging to an age of spirituality, is the more far-reaching and complete, and its results might be usefully combined with and guide the western. With the aid of theosophy and of modern science this is seen to be possible. The saṁskāras are based ultimately upon certain fundamental truths in Nature which underlie human development or evolution, both spiritual and physical, and a knowledge of the scientific facts of development leads to a clearer understanding of the nature, value and use of the saṁskāras and points to a common ground and connecting link between the ancient science and the modern.

THE THREE ANTE-NATAL SAMSKĀRAS.

The following are the scientific facts gathered from the text:

The ovum (rajas) having been fertilised by the spermatozoon (vīrya), a process of growth and development in the fertilised ovum at once begins. The process is a three-fold one and therefore comprises three main stages whether viewed from the objective (physical) standpoint or from the subjective (superphysical) standpoint. These physical stages are successive as regards the time in ante-natal life when they are initiated, each stage being definitely marked

off from the others by certain anatomical and physiological characteristics.

The first period includes, on the physical side, all the structural and physiological changes which occur in the fertilised ovum from the moment of fertilisation until the time when the "trunk and limbs and organs" have become clearly defined and the tiny "embryonic body" —a miniature of the human form—is fit and ready for the entrance into it of the jīva (the individualised life, or spiritual entity) for whose use the body has been formed, and is to be further developed.

This miniature human form has been "formed by the multiplication" (the cleavage or segmentation) "of the compound atoms" (conjoined pro-nuclei) "of germ and sperm." "Each such atom" (pro-nucleus) "is a trinity" (a complete morphological unit or set of characters) "and possesses the power of multiplication etc.," (the power of evolving through a cycle of life) that "manifests everywhere in the World-process" (the drama of cyclic life). "It is the beginning of reflexion about Brahman."

During this first period of growth and development the "jīvāṭmā" (the spiritual entity or individuality) "is connected with the atoms of the body in the womb" (with the pro-nuclei, or centre of formative activity and formative

differentiation). When the pro-nuclear activity and differentiation are completed, the jīvāṭmā (individualised life) whose connexion with the pro-nuclei initiated the pro-nuclear or formative activity, "comes and enters into the embryonic body" or miniature human form and the second stage of growth and development begins.

The second stage is "the fixing of the connexion between the jīva and the body," or the rendering of the body viable. The "trunk and limbs and organs" of the tiny "embryonic body" or miniature human form which is as yet incapable of living apart from the maternal forces that pulse through it, receives a fresh stream of life or downpour of vital force or energy, and by the new impluse to development which is thereby given, the "embryonic body" is further developed and differentiated and becomes a fœtus, or finished embryonic body, capable of carrying on the vital functions of the human organism and of living an independent life of its own. "It is the completion of the consciousness of the I, and the I is the Āṭmā."

This period includes therefore on the physical side all the anatomical and physiological modifications by which the "embryonic body" becomes a viable fœtus or human organism whose life-forces are centred in the fœtal heart, their primal seat, and thence pulse through the fœtal body. About this, Madame Blavatsky writes;

"The heart is the king, the most important organ in the body of man....The spot in the heart which is the last of all to die, is the seat of life, the centre of all, Brahmā, the first spot that lives in the fœtus and the last that dies." (*S. D.*, iii, p. 582.)

With the attainment of viability, "the stay of the jīva has been assured" (physical life is possible for the child) and the *third stage* in ante-natal life is entered. It consists in making "known all the conditions and stages that the jīva passes through," and is an impressing of the distinctly human characteristics upon the fœtal organs and brain of this human fœtus or organism which is being fashioned for the use of the incoming entity or spiritual man. On the objective side, the anatomical and physiological changes initiated during this stage of growth, are therefore those which result in the formation of cerebral fissures peculiar to the human brain, and the expansion and growth of the brain cells and allied structures, which fit the human organism for the functioning therein of the human mind, changes which result in the formation of other fissures in the brain besides the primary ones. Keith in his *Human Embryology and Morphology*, page 253 writes: "In the seventh month the fissures on the human brain have a remarkable correspondence to

those on the cerebrum of an ape," and "The neuroblasts in the cortex have reached nearly their full number by the seventh month; after then it is their dendrites and collateral fibres that continue to develop". It is "the conjunction of the I with the this." On the *subjective* side, this period is characterised by the giving to the child of a thinking principle, "that portion of the Divine which goes to animate the personality, consciously separating itself, like a dense but pure shadow, from the Divine Ego, wedges itself into the brain and senses of the fœtus, at the completion of its seventh month" and "becomes, as the child grows, a distinct thinking principle in man, its chief agent being the physical brain." (*S. D.*, iii. 511-512).

To one who has studied western science and knows the facts and basic principles of Comparative Embryology, the correctness of this outline is self-evident; it contains no statement which in any way contradicts the observations and researches made in Embryology. The facts observed and recorded by scientists readily find their place in this outline, and there is left upon one's mind the conviction that the author of the *Praṇava Vāḍa* was familiar with all the essential facts of Comparative Embryology and their bearing upon human life in general, with all the main facts of heredity and of other

mysteries of life and death. The key to the understanding of the ancient teaching is given when the ideas expressed in the eastern books are put into the technical language of modern science. This has become possible to-day through the work of Dr. J. Beard, whose researches in Comparative Embryology, commenced in 1888 and published in 1904, confirm these ancient teachings—and the teachings of theosophy—in two very important respects, *viz.*

(I) Dr. Beard's researches prove that there is "a morphological continuity of germ-cells from generation to generation;" that "the germ-cells" are not "somatic in origin;" that "they exist prior to the appearance of any trace of a soma;" that the formation of the primary germ-cells takes place "before any trace of an embryo" has been laid down; that one of these primary germ-cells goes "to the unfolding of an embryo to contain the rest" which on its formation "migrate into it along the connexion between embryo and yolk-sac, the yolk-stalk." In these researches "was afforded" says Dr. Beard, "the possibility of following in a distinct and tangible form, and without the assumption of the continuity of an hypothetical, intangible germ-plasm (Weismann), the track of germinal continuity from one generation to the next, and "the formation of an embryo sinks into the

position of being a mere incident in the life-cycle."

About this subject, Madame Blavatsky has written: "*These germinal cells do not have their genesis at all in the body of the individual, but proceed directly from the ancestral germinal cell passed from father to son through long generations.*" (*S. D.*, i. 244). And again, "Weismann in his hereditary germ-theory is very near truth." (*S. D.*, iii. 592). She gained her knowledge of these facts from the researches of eastern science.

(II) "From the worms to man himself," writes Dr. Beard, "the products of the early cleavage are concerned, not in the formation of an embryo, but of an asexual foundation or larva—a series of temporary and transient organs *that precede an embryo* or sexual generation." "By looking at the phenomena in this light it becomes possible to compare together, so as to show their essential identity, the phenomena in the life-cycle of a hydrozoon, a worm, a mollusc, an insect, a fish, a mammal, and a man. And to these must be added the higher plants, or metaphyta. In other words, *it reveals the unity of organic nature*!"[1] Thus do the most

---

[1] "*A Morphological Continuity of Germ-cells as the Basis of Heredity and Variation*," by J. Beard, D. Sc., p.133.

recent researches of modern science illustrate and serve to confirm the ancient teachings of the unity of all life. Madame Blavatsky writes: "The human fœtus follows in its transformations all the forms that the physical frame of man assumed, throughout the three Kalpas (Rounds). ..... In the present age, the physical embryo is a plant, a reptile, an animal, before it finally becomes man, evolving within himself his own ethereal counterpart, in his turn." (*S. D.*, i. p. 206). The form becomes even more highly differentiated and complex, and the powers of the life within show themselves and shine forth through it ever more and more fully and perfectly.

On the *form*-side, if the language of Comparative Embryology is used, the first samskāra denotes the impulse to development from the "fertilisation of the ovum" to the "critical period"; the second samskāra denotes the impulse to development from the "critical period" to the "viability stage of the fœtus"; the third samskāra denotes the development from "viability" to "full term."

The author mentions also the subjective side of ante-natal life and he gives its broad outlines: the jīva connected with the fertilised ovum and exercising an influence upon the growing physical body throughout the whole of

ante-natal life; the entrance of the j ī v a into the physical body making viability possible and laying the foundation for the exercise later of the psychic (mental) faculties which are regarded as distinctly "human," and which distinguish the psychic life of the human mind from the psychic life of the animal mind.

Of the *life*-side—of that which gives the impulse to the development of the form out of the fertilised ovum, western science tells nothing. "The two chief difficulties of the science of Embryology—namely, what are the forces at work in the formation of the fœtus, and the *cause* of 'hereditary transmission' of likeness, physical, moral and mental—have never been properly answered; nor will they ever be solved, till the day when scientists condescend to accept the occult theories." (*S. D.*, i. 243.) "*These germinal cells proceed directly from the ancestral germinal cell passed from father to son through long generations* . . . . How will biologists explain the first appearance of this everlasting cell?" asks Madame Blavatsky. (*S. D.*, i. 244.)

The subjective side of ante-natal life and the influence exercised by the j ī v a on the development of the fertilised ovum are still unknown to western science,—hence the impassible gulf to-day between western science and religion; and also the inability to understand and to cope successfully with those social and moral

problems that are stirring profoundly the hearts and minds of men and women in the west; hence too, the many, as yet unanswered questions about heredity, about ways of improving the human race, about man's spiritual nature and immortality, about future life, and about other mysteries of life and death,—all of which are known to eastern science and, when understood, make the institution and use of samskāras intelligible.

"The problem of heredity is almost the greatest one in embryological science" says Dr. Beard. His patient and long continued researches, by western physical methods, have led him to the discovery of a morphological continuity of germ-cells,—a discovery long before made by eastern scientists or occultists who had recourse to the superphysical (clairvoyant) methods of occult subjective science. "No earnest investigator can ignore the immense, the overwhelming importance of this continuity for the science of embryology. It and the various facts associated with it, are bound sooner or later to revolutionise completely the ideas and conceptions of zoologists, anatomists and embryologists." In these words does Dr. Beard unwittingly testify to the truth and value of the occult science of eastern sages.

THE FOURTH SAMSKĀRA—JĀTA-KARMA.

The completion of the third stage of embryological development is followed by the birth of the child, and for this the fourth samskāra is performed. Ante-natal life has provided the jīva with a physical body sufficiently developed to permit of its being used as an independent organism wherewith to carry on physiological, psychic and mental activities. But until birth has actually taken place, this independent functioning is still only a possibility, not yet an actuality; the fœtal lungs, although perfectly formed, are in the condition known as atelectasis (the air-cells not yet expanded and filled with air), and the circulation still includes the passage of the blood through the placenta, and there is a communication between the right and left auricle of the heart.

At birth, with the first breath that the child draws, air enters and expands the atelectic lungs. The relative change in blood-pressure thereby produced, causes the Eustachian valve of the heart to close, blood can no longer pass from the right auricle into the left auricle and the placental circulation soon ceases. Other secondary structural changes in the vascular system complete the adaptation of the child's organism to the new conditions and environment; among these, may be mentioned the obliteration of the Ductus Arteriosus (? secondary suṣhumnā)

some ten or twelve days after birth,—a fœtal vessel between the left pulmonary artery and aorta, immediately below the point at which the left carotid artery is given off from the arch of the aorta. Unless the changes in the fœtal lungs and heart take place, the physiological activities necessary to independent existence cannot be carried on, and the new-born child cannot live; it will be "still-born". Therefore the jāṭa-karma is "the accompaniment of the success of the wish 'May I be many,' *i.e.*, of the wish for progeny". It is "performed for the maintenance of that success" *i.e.*, for the continued life of the new-born child. "All action being threefold, *viz.*, birth, stay, and death, the endeavour to secure stay naturally follows after birth," and to secure stay it is necessary that some of the general life force, the energy of the jīva, shall be specifically set apart (individualised or differentiated) to carry on independently the vital (physiological) functions of the new-born body, as the "prāṇa" of that body. "Jīva becomes prāṇa only when the child is born and begins to breathe." (*S. D.*, iii. 545.)

During intra-uterine life, the child's body is bathed by the Liquor Amnii of the ovum, and the effect of the rhythmical contractions of the uterus upon this bag of fluid will, in accordance with the laws of hydrostatics, be such as to

produce general rhythmical wave-like forms of stimuli on the nerve ends of the fœtal body which call forth the seemingly "spontaneous" rhythmical activities, termed microkinesis and micropsychosis. In this way the child's nervous system is developed during the intra-uterine life up to the point of ability to respond to general stimuli and at birth readily shows forth these "spontaneous" forms of general activity. But, after birth, there is a change of environment, and external stimuli can reach the nerve-ends in the ordinary way and give rise to definite, localised, "respondent" forms of activity—local (or specific) sensory motor responses or reactions,—"sensations" and "actions" as they are technically called. By these definite responses or reactions to definite external stimuli, specialised (individualised) sensory and motor paths are developed in the brain and spinal cord, "sensory and motor tracts," and thus the physical foundations are laid which later make intellectual activity possible. Among the early sensations and actions may be noted those which are referred to the skin and to the respiratory and digestive tracts, *viz.*, tactile sensations and the infant's "cry" or "vocal act" when there is bodily discomfort, and the infant's "sucking" or "buccal act" when any object is put into its mouth. "In the corresponding true consecra-

tion the idea is 'What is this, of which I have become aware? What accrues to me by that which this is?'" *i.e.*, by that awareness of something ("sensation") which I have experienced? It would seem, therefore, that on the subjective side, the jāṭa-karma refers to the experiencing or becoming aware of external stimuli that affect the nerve-ends of the organism, or to the development of the "Sensation-subjective" state, upon which the evolution of the concrete mind and intellectual faculties of the child depend; for as Madame Blavatsky writes: "Mind as we know it, is resolvable into states of consciousness, of varying duration, intensity, complexity, etc., all, in the ultimate, resting on sensation." (*S. D.*, i. 31.)

THE FIFTH SAMSKĀRA—NĀMA-KARAṆA.

"Brahman is one" asserts the Unity of all Life or Consciousness; all comes from and is God; "still separateness appears therein" because of the many separate organisms or forms, in which that Life or Consciousness is focussed or individualised for the gaining of individual experience,—"the reason for all evolution" being "the gaining of experience." (*S. D.*, iii. 559.)

"And those that appear separate have separate names also fitly," because each functions and works, in his own separate form or organism,

as an individualised Life, or Spirit, or Name, evolving his own separative mind, both abstract and concrete—and his own individual consciousness. "In truth however all names belong to all," because all individuals or individualised lives originate in the same way from the One Life which has been focussed in a multitude of forms or germinal cells evolving in the same way, though at different stages and in varied order of detail. An individualised life consists, therefore, always of a form or body (the This) in which a ray of the One Life is focussed, and of the Life (the I) which is individualised as a ray in that particular form, between which and itself a particular definite inter-relation is thereby established. The "true naming" or "the thinking of the This by the I and of the I by the This," expresses this inter-relation established between the Form and the Consciousness, and is a "mutual cognition between them, so to say," or a state of consciousness which is common to both.

Western experimental (Practical) Psychology is still in its infancy, so it is difficult to convey eastern psychological knowledge, because of the lack of scientific terms in which to express the eastern ideas. On the objective side, this samskāra may perhaps best be described as concerned with the development of those parts

of the nervous system by which the various organs and other parts of the body become especially connected with, or related to, the developing consciousness of the child; and, on the subjective side would include therefore all so-called "organic or internal sensations," *i.e.*, the internal sensations of strain, pressure, the muscular sense, articular sense, and so on. Every internal body-change or body-activity, produces a corresponding change in the consciousness, an "internal or organic sensation". Every internal conciousness-change or concious-ness-activity, produces a corresponding internal bodily-change and therefore "internal or organic sensation." The "internal or organic sensation" is common to both body-activity and consciousness-activity, is essential to each of them, and may call forth both of them, so that, a body-activity (Eṭaṭ utterance) and consciousness-activity (Aham utterance) being both called forth, Eṭaṭ may be said to be included in Aham and Aham in Eṭaṭ, the inter-relation or inter-connexion being "organic sensation" belonging to both and to either. "The name given to an object depends upon the nature of the cognition connected therewith" *i.e.*, depends upon the "internal or organic sensation" connected therewith, depends upon the child's biological organism. This is, possibly, the explanation, of Grimm's Law; slight differences in the human

biological organism becoming exaggerated by isolation from other similar human biological organisms, with the result that the "organic sensations" and vocal sounds elicited by any group of "organic sensations" differ slightly in these cases —and these vocal-sound differences having been observed and tabulated the corresponding names in different languages were found to have a common element (factor) and a variable element (factor) now spoken of as Grimm's Law. "To frame sounds on the basis of that knowledge is to give names whereby things are recognised", *not* artificial or partial names that express certain attributes or qualities possessed by the biological organism and which consist of variable elements, but real, true names which express the summation of the series of all its inherent "organic sensation-possibilities," in the same way in which an algebraical formula may be said to express the summation of the series of all its algebraical term-possibilities, as *e.g.*, does the Binomial Theorem in Mathematics.

THE SIXTH SAMSKĀRA—THE CHŪḌĀ-KARAṆA.

"The real consecration implies the union of I and This, 'I am this'—the egoism of the I permeates the This fully, and the entrance into the world and the worldly life is complete." For as Madame Blavatsky says: "Manas, the Mind Ego, does not accomplish its full union with the child before

he is six or seven years of age, before which period, even according to the canon of the Church and Law, no child is deemed responsible. Manas becomes a prisoner, one with the body, only at that age." (*S. D.*, iii. 506.)

The changes peculiar to this development appear on the objective side to consist in the formation of links or paths between the vaso-motor nervous systems and the cerebrum; and on the subjective side, to refer to the evolution of the psychic life called by western psychologists 'Affection,' or 'Feeling' and defined by Titchener as 'the conscious process' arising from the way in which an organism receives a particular impression made upon it.[1] The sense of "mineness" increases when the psychic 'affective' element is added to the psychic 'sensory' element; and the "entire freedom" from conventions, from sense of shame etc., in infancy, begins to be lost. The infant did not know himself as distinguished from another, because the "I" had not as yet gone "forward into the This." "The full cognition of the I and the This, and the going forward of the I into the This" is the essence of the chūḍākaraṇa. The result is "the loss of its original character by the I,"—*i.e.*, of the 'pure sensory' or 'sensation-subjective' state, and "its complete

[1] Titchener's *Outlines of Psychology*, Edit. 1902, p. 102.

entrance into the This, the enveloping of the former by the latter"; the psychic sensory element is enveloped by the psychic affective element. The jīva has been born to "accomplish the work of the World-process" and the rite indicates the fact that henceforth this jīva engages in work,—the first work being the identification of itself (himself) with the functioning of the new physical body that he is to use. This identification of himself with the body-changes or sensations, is dependent upon 'affection' or 'feeling,' and therefore "the real consecration implies the union of I and This, 'I am This.'"

THE SEVENTH SAMSKĀRA—KARṆA-VEḌHA.

"Knowledge of all activity is implied" by the karṇa-veḍha or 'ear-boring.' The jīva is in possession of a biological organism with which it has learnt to consciously identify itself, and through which it can experience states of consciousness, made up of "sensations," "internal or organic sensations," and "affections or feeling." It realises that "all this is mine, all else, *i.e.*, that which is not mine is useless"; that this samsāra, or experience, or succession of states of consciousness, is the "chief fact, and neither the Āṭmā nor the Paramāṭmā." Having realised and affirmed this, the jīva enters upon activity, dissociating and re-associating the elements into more and more complex conscious-

ness-states, the dissociation of the 'affection-element' from the other elements being interpreted as 'pain,' the association of the 'affection-element' with new combinations of the other elements being interpreted as 'pleasure'; thus, "the sense of mineness increases further."

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER VI. (*Continued.*) Sub-Section (v).

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE YAJUR VEḌA.

The eighth sacrament, upa-nayana, investiture with the sacred thread.—Study and preparation for future duty.

The eighth sacrament is the vraṭa-banḍha, the 'binding on of the vow,' or upa-vīṭa 'approach'. Having obtained a partial knowledge of the operations of the World-process and of 'mineness,' the jīva thinks: 'This is so, generally, but I should now acquire a more detailed knowledge of the methods, the laws, the workers etc., of this World-process.' And, in consequence, he turns inward, he begins to reflect: 'In what ways should the World-process be accomplished; what are the laws underlying it,' and so on. In order to find out all this the study of subjective science is necessary. His parents also wish him to engage in such study, as the life-work of the twice-born indispensably requires such knowledge, and they therefore employ their child in the pursuit thereof. The commencement of the study is marked by a rejoicing. The upavīṭa-ceremony is performed to ward off all future hindrances. After

performing the rite, they send him away with the teacher: 'Go and learn the truth of Brahman, in the fullness of I-This-Not; the I is such, the This is such, the conjunction of the two is such, the Not is such, the conjunction of the Not and the This is such, the conjunctions of Not and I, and of Not with I and This are such, and so on; and having learnt all this, engage in the accomplishment of the I-This-Not.'

In the true consecration, the jīva, harassed with the worries of the world, distractedly asks itself: 'What is all this; is This only to be ever believed in, (must I rest content, for ever, with a blind and helpless acceptance of the unintelligibility of this condition of things,) must I ever go on circling in this round of work, though it is so full of misery?' And gradually he sinks into despondency and despair. At this stage, he who knows the whole truth of the This, becomes his teacher and instructs him: 'Such is the World-process, this is necessary, this is otherwise; know the I, know the This, know the Not, their permutations, combinations and conjunctions.' Thus does the true master teach, and this is the true upa-nayana, up-leading.

There is, indeed, only one true Ruler and Āchārya of this whole World-process, and That is defined and designated by I-This-Not; That supreme Teacher is always inspiring it. (But, in each world-system,) there is also a

separate ā c h ā r y a (Vishṇu or one of his line of sub-hierarchs?) of the I alone; another (Brahmā, etc.?) of the This: another (Shiva, etc.?) of the Not; another (Mahā-Vishṇu, etc.?) of the conjunction of the Three, and so on. As the methods and the laws of the World-process are many, so are the teachers. In accordance with this law, the teacher of each method or department of the world performs the appropriate consecration or initiation of the j ī v a connected with that method or department. Each j ī v a is guided by the ruler of the department to which it belongs.[1] Hence the need of a s a ḍ-g u r u, a true master, for the rite of s a ḍ-u p a n a y a n a.

In the ceremony the g u r u teaches the practising of the *Gāyaṭrī*, then he teaches him the *Veḍa*. Such study is true b r a h m a c h a r y a. The preceptor teaches further: Such power resides in sound; by the utterance of such a sound such

[1] Compare the theosophical doctrine of the subdivision of all j ī v a s into various rays, seven being specially mentioned; also the division into s ā ṭ ṭ v i-k a, r ā j a s a, and ṭ ā m a s a according to the *Gīṭā* and the *Purānas*. The division by j ñ ā n a, i c h c h h ā and k r i y ā as propounded here, with its permutations and combinations, illuminates and permeates all such, for all further sub-division by fives or sevens or tens and twelves and eighteens, etc., are only permutations and combinations of the primal three.

a result happens; such a transformation is brought about by such a change in the succession of the sounds; these two, (result and result, or sound and result, or sound and sound,) are joined together by such and such a cause, or disjoined by such another; such is the root-cause or essence of disjunction and conjunction, such their fruit, such the proper time, etc.; this should be done, this avoided; and so on.

All this is represented in the formal rite also. The g u r u first teaches the *Gāyaṭrī* together with the *Prvṇava,* then enjoins j a p a or repetition thereof. J a p a is the constant recollection of the word *with its meaning.* This practice is distributed over the morning, the noon and the evening. On awaking in the morning the *Gāyaṭrī* together with the *Praṇava* should be called to mind. Then, the two continuing to be borne in mind as the source of everything, the daily study should be entered on. Some one *Aṅga,* 'limb' or portion of the methods, manifestations or kinds of the This should be studied, according to the student's capacity. This process is to be repeated at noon and again in the evening.

To 'realise in thought,' s a n-ḍ h y ā-k a r a ṇ a, that the *Praṇava* and the *Gāyaṭrī* are the foundation of all, and to make sure what the cause, the motive, of the actions that we have performed is—this is the purpose of s a n ḍ h y ā. The word

means: samyak, thoroughly, completely, well, ḍhyāyaṭī, thinks, considers, ponders, sarvān, all things.[1]

In this interpretation, ḍhyāna refers to the root and sarva to the knowledge. The significance is that all knowledge should be traced to its single central root and source in the *Gāyaṭrī* (and derived genetically from one chief principle, for otherwise it remains unsystematised and therefore unscientific.)[2]

---

[1] This interpretation is not in strict accordance with modern Samskṛṭ grammar. But like all 'occult,' *i. e.*, truly scientific words and ideas, the word has many meanings and applications, each correct and each allied with all others. Sanḍhyā is the 'joining-time' of day and night, and of forenoon and afternoon, which is the fit time, especially seasonable and favourable, for the 'joining' together of the individual with the universal in the higher samāḍhi (of which it is but another form), of the human jīva with the Solar Logos or other deity, in consciousness, in the lower samāḍhi, of the 'synthesising and placing together' of separate-seeming things with each other by careful and 'proper thinking,' and so on.

[2] The statement occurs frequently that the *Praṇava* is all, that the *Mahā-Vākyas* and the *Gāyaṭrī* are the sources of the *Veḍas*, and the Veḍas the foundation of the Universe and so on. And this is also a traditional article of faith with the Hinḍū at the present day, though what it means he

Morning, noon, and eve correspond to the three times, past, present and future, and to the

---

does not know at all. Of course, this whole book is just an explanation of what it means. Yet, for the convenience of the 'modern' reader, to bring the idea a little nearer home to him, to make it appear a little less fanciful, we might try to put it in the nutshell of a foot-note. AUM means the Self, the Not-Self, and the Relation between them, according to the 'technical convention' explained in this work. Now, if so, then, when we have mentioned these three, have we not exhausted all things and everything? There is obviously nothing left, that falls outside these. These make up the World-process. In the second place, what are the main features, the principal appearances, that are most prominently and most continuously manifest in this manifestation that we call the World-process? Are they not birth and death, integration and disintegration, growth and decay, origin and dissolution? These are unmistakably the very heart-beat, the pulse, the rhythm and swing of all this procession. And are not these 'methods' of manifestation best described by 'I-This' and 'This-not'? Indeed, the permutations and combinations of A, U and M are the best descriptions of these and all subordinate methods that are variations of these; and such permutations and combinations are the *Mahā-Vākyas*. In the third place, what is the main law that underlies all these methods of manifestation? Is it not the triple law of the indestructibility of matter, the conservation of energy

Self, the Not-Self, and the Negation. The Ā ṭ m ā is the dawn; herein the I revels alone in itself, free, fresh, innocent of all world-knowledge. Hence the supreme beauty of the dawn. The Ā ṭ m ā, unlimited, unbounded, stretching and streaming like the rays of the rising sun, its visible symbol, in all directions—this itself is all light and all glory, p r a-b h ā; and that wherein this light alone exists, that is the morning, p r a-b h ā-ṭ a, the dawn. At that time, the Self Itself shines forth, b h ā ṭ i, without effort, supremely. Then comes the midday, connected with S a m-s ā r a, wherein the Self has entered into the Not-Self, and is full of action, and also full of knowledge. The evening is related to the Negation and is the time for the ceasing of all the interaction of the Self and the Not-Self. The three s a n ḍ h y ā s thus refer respectively to the I, the This, and the Not. After the evening comes the night, wherein takes place the work of dissolution, p r a l a y a, or Not-This-I (the Logion reversed).

---

and the transformation of motion? But the *Gāyaṭrī* is the embodiment of this law, (see note on s a n ḍ h y ā, at the end of this chapter, for fuller expansion of this statement); and the *Veḍas* and subsidiary scriptures are but the detailed commentaries on these three, the *Praṇava*, the *Mahā-Vākyas* and the *Gāyaṭrī*. And if this be really so, then may we not say that the traditional article of faith is justified?

From another standpoint, because of the endless permutations and combinations of I-This-Not, sanḍhyās are also endless in number and not merely three.

Only the jīva that has passed through upanayana is entitled to the sanḍhyā; such only can think Brahman, and such thinking only is true sanḍhya. The relating of Brahman or I-This-Not with time results in jñāna, ichchhā and kriyā, the summation being samāḍhi, absorption, mergence, rapport, rapture, union or identification with the object of attention or consciousness. Those who have received the upa-nayana according to the rule of the realisation of the nature of cognition, desire and action are entitled to the three sanḍhyās. The sanḍhyā is thus of three kinds, sāṭṭvikī, rājasī and ṭāmasī respectively, as referring to cognition, action, or desire. This triple sub-division is present in each of the three sanḍhyās, of the morning, the noon and the evening. Hence the declaration: The morning-sanḍhyā is best with the stars still shining, middling with the stars vanished, poorest with the sun risen; so too the midday is threefold, with forenoon, noon and afternoon; and, finally, the evening sanḍhyā is best with the sun still shining, middling with the sun set, and poorest with the stars risen. The significance of these distinctions should be grasped by reference to

the distinction of cognition, desire, and action. With the stars still shining, the dawn is only being born; when the stars are gone the dawn is full, and when it is full then contact with samsāra has begun and the free pure light of the Self no longer shines unalloyed; hence, the sanḍhyā with the stars unvanished, in the infancy of the dawn, is the best and most completely connected with cognition. The middling is the one with the stars gone and the light of the dawn at full; the birds and the beasts and other beings have begun their samsāra-work then. With the sun risen the sanḍhyā merges in samsāra and comes under 'negation, nişhiḍḍha[1], the dawn is practically dead, heat, etc., come into play and light ahd shade begin to appear in conjunction. Similarly, with regard to the midday, action has its infancy in the forenoon, its prime at noon, and its decay in the afternoon. The evening sanḍhyā is best with the sun unset, as that is the fit time for the closing of the pursuit of knowledge and activity; again, even immediately after sunset, there is still some light left for winding up the day's work; but with the stars

[1] The word nişhīḍḍha in the text has the technical meaning of 'negation' everywhere, but here it has also the ordinary significance of 'prohibited'. In modern Hinḍū life, too, the 'negative' sanḍhyās are prohibited.

risen, sanḍhyā falls within the time of pralaya and is niṣhiḍḍha (as before)[1]. There is a similar triplicity in the night also, corresponding

[1] The morning sanḍhyā seems especially to be a direction of the mind towards, and a preparation for the accumulation of, knowledge, and is therefore followed by the daily study of the forenoon, even during the household life. The midday sanḍhyā is similarly, a preparation for action, for the day's work, for the most strenuous part of which work the fit time is the afternoon. Finally, the evening sanḍhyā is a preliminary to a peaceful night of rest, after the winding up of the day's work. This seems to have been the ideal, possibly the real, routine of life amongst the older nations and societies, and is prescribed in the current *Smṛṭis* or works of Hinḍū religious law. It is possible, of course, only in a happier condition of the social organisation of humanity, such as would allow a comparatively short afternoon's bread-winning work to suffice for the supply of the needs of the twenty-four hours. At the same time it is worth noting that, though not possible to realise in its ideal perfection amidst present-day conditions, still this is the routine which is followed, in its general outlines by a considerable part of mankind to-day; accumulation of information, knowledge, reading of the daily papers if nothing else, in the mornings, business in the middle of the day, recreation and rest in the evenings, seems to be generally ordained by the physical laws of nature. The text is not quite clear

to the A, U, and M. The night too is sāṭṭvikī, rājasī and ṭāmasī, or cognitive, active and conative.

---

as to whether the *afternoon* is the fittest time for the climax of business-activity or the noon; in India, the precise noon is generally regarded, and, when possible, treated, as the time for a little repose, a siesta, and when so treated, especially in the summers, is conducive to health. Possibly, if the text was written in the cooler, northern, Himālayan portion of India, it did not take sufficient cognisance of this fact; but the very vagueness of the language of the text here, and the possibility of interpreting it in two ways, seems to indicate that the different senses would apply to different climatic conditions, the logical principle of the sub-divisions being supported by other facts not discernible by a modern reader of the text, as it stands, by itself, without further elucidations. Clearly the text would not apply to the polar regions, without being supplemented.

It may also be noted that in the brahmacharya stage, the 'business' of the midday and the winding up of the evening would also take on the form of *study* predominantly; while in the household stage, the 'study' of the morning would be similarly colored and guided by the main object of the stage, and be, predominantly, study of a kind directly conducive to the success of the business; in the 'forest' stage, all three would be prevailingly tinged with 'sacrifice'; while, finally, in the condition of the wanderer, they would all be merged in the 'summation'.

All beings thus follow the succession of day and night, and in these two taken together with the sanḍhyā we see the Trinity reappear as everywhere else. Generally speaking, the morning sanḍhyā is sāṭṭvikī, the noonday rājasī, and the evening one ṭāmasī; though each of these three kinds reappears again as a sub-division of each. Of all who have received the upa-nayana, this observance of the sanḍhyā is the duty and the right; as the ḍhyāna or fixed thought is, so is the gain to the jīva; ḍhyāna is Brahman; ḍhyāṭā, the thinker, is Brahman; ḍhyeya, the object thought, is Brahman too. Hence (as Manu ordains): He who observeth not the morning sanḍhyā, nor observeth the evening sanḍhyā, like a shūḍra should he be excluded from all work wherein the twice-born should officiate. For the inference as to such a one is that he pursues not nor even aspires after Brahman, and has not apperception, the subjective consciousness, but wears only the visible thread and is twice-born but in name[1].

[1] Compare the interpretation of 'twice-born' by James in his *Varieties of Religious Experience*. He who has not longed after an explanation of the paradoxes of the world, who has not achieved the Self and the Self-consciousness which enables us 'to see ourselves as others see us,' who is not able to understand and deal with other selves as with him-

Various acts, āchamana, prāṇāyāma, muḍrā etc., are prescribed for the sanḍhyā also.[1]

Āchamana is the preparatory purification, by means of water, for entrance into meditation on and realisation of Brahman. The water is consecrated by the power of a manṭra and then drunk for the purification of the heart. The power of sound is the chief of all forces (at the present stage of evolution, its substratum, ākāsha, being the subtlest and most potent element so far manifested); hence the consecration with the sound of the manṭra; without the manṭra, the āchamana is worthless.

self, he is not twice-born, not a true 'gentleman,' (for he *cannot be gentle* to others unless he consciously or subconsciously and instinctively knows them to be himself and so can put himself in the position of others).

[1] Certain other accessories of meditation, aṅga-nyāsa, kara-nyāsa, etc., are spoken of and endeavoured to be interpreted in the *Introduction* to *The Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā* by Annie Besant and Bhagavān Ḍās. For details as to current interpretations of prāṇāyāma, muḍrā, āsana, etc., the *Gheraṇda Samhiṭā*, translated by Srīsh Chanḍra Bose, may be consulted. One distinction between muḍrā and āsana may be made by regarding the former as 'gesture, expression, attitude' and the latter as 'posture'.

Prāṇāyāma is threefold, as said before, kumbhaka, rechaka and pūraka, retention, expiration, and inspiration. The samsāra appears and manifests by and in the way of these three only, for this triplet appears in every atom in every moment. 'Know Brahman to be such' (*i.e.*, to consist of this triple movement—this is the result of prāṇāyāma in its metaphysical significance.)

Muḍrā is mutual conjunction. We see that one object is born from another; that after the birth, the producer disappears; that another is born from that produced object again, and the latter disappears in turn. This oscillation of birth and disappearance proceeds apace, endlessly, by means of mutual conjunction. Of such yoga[1] or conjunction, there are twenty-four (principal) methods, and these are indicated by the twenty-four muḍras, for the same reasons for which, as explained before, the twenty-four letters of the *Gāyaṭrī* indicate twenty-four laws or methods. 'Such is the state of the

---

[1] As in the case of so many other Samskṛṭ derivations, the word yoga here has a double significance and the two meanings have an alliance which appears on going back to the root. Yoga-muḍrā is a gesture, an arrangement, a method of balancing and 'joining' together of the limbs, corresponding to a method of yoga, meditation, 'conjunction' of thinker and object thought.

world,' 'this is so'—bearing such thoughts in the mind, to endeavour to conjoin and unify all—this is the practice of m u ḍ r ā. Its essential nature is the thought, 'this has to be, and therefore I am thus also.' The various m u ḍ r ā s are: (1) I-I, (2) This-This, (3) I-I-This, (4) This-This-I, (5) This-This-Not, (6) Not-Not-This, (7) Not-This-I, and so on, altogether twenty-four[1]. In the verity wherein all are one, a m u ḍ r ā has no use, so too there is nothing impure or pure, no sin and no merit; but all is necessary and connected with all under the double law of necessity and contingency, limitation or definition and endlessness or absence of limit,—to think thus is to perform the m ā n a s a-s n ā n a the mental bath, (for securing mental cleanliness and purity)[2].

Knowing all as one, the self is purified and becomes B r a h m a n. The external representation thereof is the bath in water consecrated with a m a n ṭ r a, promotive of that thought of unity.

The full procedure of the s a n ḍ h y ā is as follows:— Sit down in a steady posture, in a

---

[1] It may be remembered that the *Ṛg-Veḍa* was said to have 24 m a ṇ d l a s, and k r i y ā also said to be of 24 kinds and so on. The reason for these numbers is not quite clear.

[2] As the *Bhagavaḍ Gīṭā* says: 'There is no purifier like unto knowledge.' iv. 38.

solitary place, and think in such thoughts and words as these: What is duty, what is Brahman, what is I, what is This, what is the Relation between them. After this questioning repeat the manṭra (the Logion) that is the answer thereto. This is ḍhyāna. Then sprinkle water all around you after energising it with the appropriate manṭra. This too indicates the unity of the separable (in the all enclosing circle) 1. Thereafter, side by side with the endeavour to realise the unity of the Three, the necessity of and present in this fact should be sought. Then make the saṅkalpa with the consciousness first of the I, and then of the appearance of the Many. The saṅkalpa is the imitation of the idea 'I am this manyness'. Then make an āchamana, again endeavouring to realise purity. Then make the prāṇāyāma according to rule. (Then, or concurrently with the prāṇāyāma) the *Gāyaṭrī* should be ḍhāraṇiyā, 'borne in mind,' together with the *Praṇava* and the three *Vyāhṛṭis*, (Bhūh, Bhuvah and Svah). If, gradually, the power of the jīva increases, then

1 This states only the metaphysical aspect. The superphysical and physical significance is besides this. The process is said to have the effect of completing the 'self-containment' and freedom from outer interruption and also protection from evil disturbances, that is needed for successful meditation.

the *Gāyaṭrī* should be practised in all its fullness, *i.e.*, with the *Praṇava* and all the seven *Vyāhṛṭis*, as including all laws and methods and being the support of all supports. Ḍ h ā r a ṇ a means couduct (in or of consciousness ?) harmonious (with the sense of the *Gāyaṭrī*). M u ḍ r ā is of the nature of complete knowledge of the methods and laws of the World-process in all their conjunctions and disjunctions. The *Gāyaṭrī* should be recited in the proper m u ḍ r ā, posture, *i.e.*, while in the appropriate attitude of mind and body, and its significance pondered. With constant practice the conduct of the whole life of the j ī v a begins gradually to accord with that significance. Hence the aphorism of the *Yoga-Sūṭra*: J a p a of It is the pondering of Its meaning. Or of the *Brahma-sūṭra*: Thinking on the sense (of words) is for the sake of (attaining to) conduct (in harmony with that sense).

For such reasons should the s a n ḍ h y ā, all-helping and all-supporting, be understood clearly and practised diligently as prescribed in the ordinance: 'Observe the s a n ḍ h y ā, day by day.' 'He that diligently pursueth the s a n-ḍ h y ā at all three times, the s a n ḍ h y ā that discovereth the final truth of all things, he obtaineth the Supreme Essence, the Truth that is sensed by the highest sense alone.' Thus

should Brahman be pondered, and step by step, after the upa-nayana, should the *Aṅgas*, the *Upāṅgas* and the *Veḍas* with the *Upanishaṭs*, *Brāhmaṇas* and *Upa-veḍas*, all be studied. Thereafter, when the great Truth of all things has been grasped, the Supreme Refuge of all beings attained, and thereby the due capacity secured for the work which is the work of Brahman, the work of the World-process, then should that work, the work of the household, be undertaken.

NOTE.—In order to appreciate fully the significance of the sanḍhyā, to enter into the spirit of it, it is, necessary to have arrived at the point of view from which consciousness appears as the supreme fact and force in the World-process, guiding, governing, indeed creating all its manifestations.

Once this is realised the performance of the sanḍhyā, meditation, is seen to be practically the only means of securing power and carrying on the work of life; and it is also seen that those who do not practise it deliberately and with formality do so sub-consciously and irregularly. All thinking is seeking, seeking to establish relations, and all seeking is prayer; and therefore not only all thought, but indeed all activity, effort, aspiration, is such, addressed sub-consciously or deliberately, either to the Total Whole, or an individual being. 'To win by one's own exertion' is also to pray to the Universal Storehouse, in the form of *wishing* ardently. As described here, and

as practised in various forms in modern Hinḍū life, the essence of it is the drawing in, by means of an exertion of or within consciousness, of nourishment and force from some great fount and reservoir of it. Force, power, energy, etc., cannot come to one place and be used by an individual without being drawn away from some other place or person; this fact we see summed up in the laws of the conservation of energy or persistence of force, the transformation of motion, and the indestructibility of matter. The *Gāyaṭrī*-prayer is only a practical application to daily life, on the mental plane, of this triple law, as said in a previous footnote. On the physical plane, for the support of our physical life, we draw the necessary nourishment from the earth, in the shape of solids, liquids, gases, ethers, etc., directing our consciousness (or sub-consciousness) that way and using the necessary instruments; and the earth draws her nourishment and vitality from the sun, which again draws its food from some higher sun and so on endlessly, the pralaya or dissolution of one system conducing to the sarga or creation of another and *vice versa*, in an endless chain of transformation and balancing. And this goes on not only on our physical plane, but on an endless number of planes. To recapitulate what has already been said in a previous note, our world-system deals with seven such planes, represented by the seven *Vyahṛṭis* or 'exclamations' that are uttered with the *Gāyaṭrī*, but present humanity has reached up to and developed the third only and not

the subtler four. Hence, the *Gāyatṛī*—which is an invocation of the sun, the Mahā-Vishṇu, the central fount and source of all the life on every plane of our world-system, and a prayer, a direction of the consciousness, to him, 'to inspire *our* intelligence,'-the collective intelligence of the whole of humanity, so as to inspire sympathetic co-operation and mutual good-will and help—is to be directed to and practised upon the *third* plane, Svah, the matter of which is the matter which in us *is intelligence*, mind-stuff, mental matter. The other two planes, the physical and astral, are also named, as Bhūh and Bhuvah, respectively, and the prayer indirectly covers them, but is mainly directed towards the intelligence-inspiring forces of the sun, for the mind is the most important feature, the most prominent and indeed differentiating characteristic of humanity, (from the Samskṛṭ root m a n, to think) and governs its life on the other two planes. If the intelligence were perfect, the life of the other two planes would be made perfect also. When the other subtler planes come into manifestation in the life of our humanity, and become to us as the Svah plane is now, and the less subtle planes including the Svah become as the physical plane is now, then 'the power of the j ī v a increasing,' he will reach up to and work with the higher *Vyāhṛṭis*. M a n-ṭ r a s, postures, etc., are helpful, indeed sometimes necessary, for these meditations, in the same way that implements and instruments and right ways of holding tools are helpful, nay indispensable, for the

successful performance of the work of ordinary life. In order to appreciate the value of m u ḍ r ā s, the psycho-physical parallelism between conditions of body, especially of all sensor and motor organs, and states of consciousness should be studied; *e. g.*, the eye-balls mechanically turn up during sleep, and to turn up the eyeballs consciously will promote sleep, or to turn them towards the frontal sinus at the root of the nose will help to bring on that semi-comatose condition wherein consciousness does not merge into sleep, but tends into deliberate and self-controlled clairvoyance; when we think of our heart, endeavouring to concentrate the mind or consciousness there (*Yoga-Suṭra*, iii, 1.) the eyeballs automatically turn towards the tip of the nose, so to consciously turn them to the tip of the nose will help ḍ h ā r a ṇ ā in the heart; during intense concentration of attention on any subject, the breathing becomes almost imperceptible, and to regulate the breathing deliberately will help such concentration, *vice versa*; during certain activities of mind or body, certain nerve-centres or nerves are excited in a special degree, and to excite the latter deliberately by the concentration of consciousness on them will promote those activities in turn, *e. g.*, it has been found in hypnotic experiments that the suggestion of a gesture has been followed by a corresponding emotion in the subject; thus if it was suggested to him to contract his brows in a frown and clench his fist, he did so and also showed all other symptoms of being evidently angry; even mental moods

which are predominantly intellectual have also their characteristic physical accompaniments, and *vice versa*, as for instance, the 'expressive' gestures of orators and teachers. And so on. Indeed the science of the s a n ḍ h y ā is but the science of y o g a ; it is a psycho-physical science which gives to mind as well as body the due share of each, regarding both as equally important. And because the general principles underlying it are true and applicable everywhere and on all scales, the education of a child that is just beginning its alphabet as well as the educing of a consciousness that could cope with the affairs of a whole solar system, therefore is such great stress laid upon the regular performance of s a n ḍ h y ā in the Hinḍū religious books.

———

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER VI. (*Continued.*)—Sub-Section (vi).

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE YAJUR-VEḌA.

The ninth to the fifteenth sacraments.--(9) The 'bath-rite' closing study.—(10) Marriage.—(11) The home-coming with the bride.—(12) The second bringing of the bride.—(13) Parentage.—(14) Progenition.—(15) Retirement from the household.

(i) The ninth sacrament is the snāṭa-vraṭa, which marks the completion of the brahmacharya stage. After such completion, the knowledge of Brahman having been gained, there arises the desire to become Brahman, and the looking forward to the performance of the work of Brahman. This is the snāṭa-vraṭa, the 'bath-rite,' the ceremonial bath which marks the completion of the student-life and the beginning of the household. Its real aspect signifies such ideas as these: The accomplishment of the truth of Brahman is to be brought about; by what method may this be done?; the manner of bringing about the conjunction of the I with the This, and the fruit of that conjunction should be pursued, etc. The unreal form and external representation thereof is the looking for a bride: Should I marry

such an one or such another; is the family free of defect, or, if not, is the defect or disease curable; does it possess positive merits which counterbalance the demerits, or is it merely negatively free of defects; if I marry such an one, what will be the consequence? And so on.

(j) The tenth sacrament is uḍvāha, marriage. When the development and maturity of the seed are complete and strong in him, and kāma or creative desire moves thereto, then should the youth marry a maid younger than himself. The work of Brahman is accomplished thereby. The idea thereof is, 'May I become many.' And there is a joy and an elation corresponding to it. Here, in this state of marriage, under the guidance of the bride's and bridegroom's knowledge of Brahman, arises a unity of work, a co-operation, a similarity of interests, an assonance of temperaments, and a unanimity of thought and opinion between the man and the woman. The husband is the Self, the wife is the Not-Self, and their union, their common tastes and temper, all their communion, in short, is of the nature of the Negation[1].

[1] The word negation has a somewhat startling effect in such a connexion, even after the explanations that have been given before, of its full significance and its technical employment in this work. But, to show that even that current sense of the word which is the chief cause of this startling

Such is the sacrament of marriage; kriyā predominates therein and it is one of the principal samskāras.

The true consecration here is the conjunction of I and This, Purușha and Prakṛṭi, Self and Not-Self, as already explained before. It is true that these two are never separate, yet such separation and reunion take place in appearance, in connexion with action and succession. And all this marriage, etc., is an imitation of that fact.

Brahma-charya should be observed equally by youth and maiden. The marriage of a brahma-chārī youth with a brahma-chāriṇī maiden is the most praiseworthy. When both know Brahman, they will not suffer from the violence of joys and sorrows, breach of rules and inobservance of regular times, and consequent disturbances and diseases of mind and body. The pair will do the work of the household with inner freedom and happiness, unattached and yet attached to all, and knowing all

---

effect, is also not altogether without an application here, it may be noted that while, in the fact of marriage, there is clearly a unification, on the one hand, there is also, on the other hand, a negation of utter identification implied in the very difference of nature and individuality of the two; connexion, relation, is, essentially, an agreement in difference, an affirmation in negation.

to be one and the same. On the other hand, as is generally recognised, marriage without a preceding and successful b r a h m a-c h a r y a brings only unhappiness; for the setting right of disturbances, unavoidable in the stress of the household life, is possible only by means of the knowledge contained in the *Veḍas* and the *Upa-veḍas*. The knowers of these understand that in the World-process disease exists as well as its remedy, and changes of form, birth and death, dissolution and creation, sleeping and waking, day and night, are always taking place, and that they should not bring pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow, in undue excess and seriousness, to them. Action, motion, movement, doing of work—this one fact stretches all around and everywhere, in all ways, in all time, and in all space. They who undertake the burden of the household life with this knowledge, they undergo no undue elations and depressions but ever are at peace, full of knowledge, full of confidence, full of bliss.

On this principle (of securing a perfect parity between bride and bridegroom) is based the examination of j ā ṭ i, genus, type, caste, and other matters. 'My individuality, my constitutional peculiarity, is such; my p r a k ṛ ṭ i, general nature and powers are such; my heredity, the characteristic of my family, our way of thinking, our family-business are such and such'—having

examined all these matters carefully the proper thing to do is to marry a maiden whose circumstances are in accord with those of the youth. If such matters are not thought of, then troubles arise, and disparity of nature, and mutual repulsion, and unhappiness generally.

The systematic examination of these matters is known as gaṇana, calculation, in Jyautiṣha-shāstra or the science of astrology. The nature of the mental, super-physical and physical constitution of both is determined by an examination of their names, times of birth, lagna, rāshi, etc., and then it can be seen whether they agree or not. This is the work of the astrologer. In the matter of the examination of the family, the elders should be consulted. They can say: Such are the heredity and traditions of this family, such their occupation, such their ancestry, etc. Then both youth and maiden should be examined by a physician to determine the compatibility or otherwise of their conditions of physical health and temperaments. And so on.

Yet again, the unity of their vyāpāra, 'operation', business-habits, interests, tastes, should be ascertained by means of the science of Kalāpa[1]; for when the vyāpāra is divergent

[1] It is not clear what particular science is meant by this name, possibly economics. Other sciences are also referred to, *e.g.*, Kāma-shāstra or the science

then too is mutual affection impossible. Only after such a careful examination, in all respects, can the sacrament of marriage be performed with honour and success. Hence the counsel that marriage ought to take place only when all the sciences give their consent to it, and when both bride and bridegroom have perfected knowledge.

(*k*) The eleventh sacrament is the vaḍhū-pravesha, the entrance, the home-bringing, of the bride. After the marriage comes the familiarisation of the bride with the members of her new family generally, and with the husband especially. The principal feature thereof is the promotion of mutual intimacy between the pair. Its essence is the determination, the ascertainment by each other, of the knowledge possessed by each in respect of cognition, action, desire and their summation. It is fitting that the bride should disclose to her new family her accomplishments and qualifications. She gives joy to her husband's parents and relations thereby. All this is the 'manifestation of qualities,' guṇa-prakāshana, and the World-process is but a manifestation of the qualities residing in the All-substance, Mūla-prakṛṭi.

---

of love, for determination of the minuter but often important details of their sex-nature, and Nīṭi-shāsṭra, jurisprudence, for the ascertainment of their avasṭhā, legal status, and so on.

The true consecration here is the full knowledge of I-This-Not and the entrance upon the right path in consequence.

(*l*) The twelfth sacrament is the ḍvir-āgamana, the second bringing, of the wife to her husband's house. The bride should go back again to her father's house after the vaḍhū-pravesha. She goes there and again studies the sciences of kriyā and kāma with her mother. Finishing the study and attaining full capacity for performing her duties she comes back the second time to her husband's house, mates with him in the proper time to the enhancement of their mutual love and joy, and helps and serves with propriety the members of the household, the relations, the kinsmen, the cousins and the brothers of her husband.

The true ḍvir-āgamana is the knowledge of the laws of *re-birth*, of the ways in which the human being dies and is born again, the principles on which the endless succession of day and night, evolution and re-absorption, existence and non-existence, take place. Everywhere is this World-process a 'second coming', a repetition. The activity of samsāra is dual, going and coming. 'Going' is inwards, towards the Self; 'coming' is outwards, towards the Not-Self; apart from these two there is naught. In the junction of the two, there appear words and language. Otherwise, indeed, there is no speaker, no

spoken, and no speech. The significance of the true consecration is this: 'This is I' and 'I is This'; the I is the going, the This is the coming. The external imitation thereof is the ceremony known under the name of ḍvir-āgamana.

The shukra[1], is taken into consideration at this time; it is the reproductive cell, also the planet Venus which governs its development. The 'consideration' of the shukra is for the purpose of making sure of sexual maturity. After knowledge has been matured, the cell also

---

[1] It is customary in modern Hinḍū life to make sure that the position of the planet Venus is favorable according to the rules of astrology, before performing the rite of the 'second coming.' *Shukra*, which means the planet Venus, the reproductive cell, the Hierarch-Priest and Preceptor of the Ḍaiṭyas or Titans (corresponding to the Third Race of theosophical literature), white color, Vishṇu, and also Brahman (the seed and container of the whole World-process) is one of those many Samskṛṭ words which, meaning many different and apparently utterly disconnected things, hint by that very fact at an underlying connexion between those various seeming things. *The Secret Doctrine* tells us that many hierarchs and other jīvas came over from the planet Venus during the evolution of the Third Root-Race here on the earth, and that the division into two sexes of humanity was made in the middle of that Race.

matures with age.[1] When both are mature, then only should the work of marriage begin. The true shukra is the union of the I with the

[1] According to Samskṛṭ Vaiḍyaka physiology, the shukra-kalā, the generative energy, vital sap, peculiar dermal tissue or membranous or other constituent of the organism, proceeding from its nerve-centre in the head reaches the breasts about the sixteenth year in man, and at that time puberty, the capacity to procreate, commences. But the process of the downward ramification is completed and the system fully matured only when the toes have been reached, and that takes place at about the 36th year, or middle age, the universally recognised prime of life, which is also the ideal time for closing brahma-charya according to the *Smṛṭis.* In terms of consciousness, seminal energy begins with knowledge of these matters, in the head, and gradually descends to the heart, that is, inspires desire, and finally, permeating the other parts of the body, the actional organs, fructifies in the act of creation. As this shukra-kalā advances and spreads more and more strongly and thickly, the skin takes on the bloom, the lāvaṇya, the 'saltiness,' *namakīnī* in the Persian language, the crystal gleam, the pearly shine, which is the essence of the good complexion and which is more than half the beauty of youth. Even in saying this, another of those remarkable instances of the philosophy and science hidden in philology and in popular words comes up. Salt, at least according to old Indian Vaiḍyaka, as food and

This. This alone is jñāna, knowledge, whence *memory*, whence virility. The vīrya, the generative energy, of this saṁsāra is smaraṇa[1]

in external application, is medically connected with skin-diseases, many of which have a venereal origin, as is generally recognised; and the latest researches of physiologists, (especially Loeb in America) tend to establish a connexion between the fertilisation of germs and saline solutions. Compare the biblical expression, 'Ye are the salt of the earth'. In Indian medicine, salt is forbidden during the treatment of some skin-diseases. It may be added that, according to *Vaiḍyaka*, food undergoes gradual transformation, one after the other, into seven ḍhāṭus, tissues, constituents of the living body, in the course of one lunar month, that the seventh and finest is shukra, and that, if this is conserved by brahma-charya, (see *Yoga-Sūṭra*, ii. 38), the next or eighth transformation carries it on to a subtler or higher plane as ojas, sahas, balam, etc., 'magnetism,' 'glow,' 'bloom,' 'energy,' 'vigour,' 'radiance,' 'glory,' 'halo,' 'aura,' as it variously and vaguely appears and is called. (See *Viṣhṇu Bhāgavaṭa*, Shrīḍhara's *Tīkā*, II. vi. 44; *Charaka*, Sūṭrasṭhāna, XXX; and *Vāgbhata*, V. XL. 4).

[1] Smaraṇa means memory, recollection, in Saṁskṛṭ, Smara means Cupid, Kāma-ḍeva, the god of love or desire, whose principal nourishment is derived from the memory of, the dwelling in imagination on, the perfections of the beloved; and vīrya means the seed, the seminal germ, and also

only: My father did thus; I did thus; this is or was the result; if this is done again, the consequence will again be the same; this man acts thus and we too do or should do the same; I do or shall do it also, etc.—this kind of activity of the process of recollection in its threefold form of vismṛṭi, smṛṭi and anusmṛṭi, (forgetting, recollection, and gradual recollection back or 'reminding' in connexion with expectation) is the means of accomplishing the business of life. This sacrament is also a necessary one, therefore, with reference to sexual maturity.

(*m*) The thirteenth sacrament is the prasūṭa. It is performed generally at the time of the first conception (only and not the subsequent ones.) The first conception, (because of the previous virgin purity of the parents?) is the time for great souls[1] to enter into the human uterus, and there-

---

virility, vigour, energy. We may here note the fact that presence of mind is essentially memory, conscious or sub-conscious, of similar situations successfully dealt with in the past, or worked out beforehand in imagination (See *Yoga-Sūṭra*, i. 20); also the view of modern evolutionists that the parent-cell is in a sense immortal and is the seat and store of all racial and individual experience, *i.e.*, memory.

[1] This no doubt was the rule in the earlier days of humanity when the hierarchic, patriarchal or aristocratic form of government was secured by laws of primogeniture; for the superphysical and physical

fore the firm establishment of the fœtus in the uterus and the prevention of such mishaps as

worlds work in with each other. Compare Manu's declaration on the subject, to the effect that the first is the child of ḍharma and the subsequent the results of kāma, mere sex-desire. With the growth of the human race and of the spirit of democracy, these customs fall more and more into desuetude. In accordance with the law of analogy, as above so below, these laws and customs have to be interpreted on various scales, in the individual, the family, and the race. In the family, *e. g.*, from the standpoint of the children, the 'government' is by elders, patriarchs; when they are grown up, it is democratic, republican, all are equal; finally they separate and found new families, and again repeat the government by elders on a higher level. In the race, the elders and patriarchs become the hierarchs and divine beings with rights of primogeniture; the second stage is the growth of the republican spirit, of democracy; the third, of emigration and founding of new empires, kingdoms, colonies. So, again, in the individual, even to-day, the *first* of any kind or set of experiences is matter for especial demonstration of feeling, care, anxiety and rejoicing. In the earlier days of the bifurcation of sexes, in the latter half of the life of the Third Root-Race, sex-development and fructification must have been times for special remark and demonstration; later on the thing became common, indeed commonplace. Pathologically also, there is greater danger of miscarriage at the first conception.

abortion, should be secured with the help of the power of sound residing in mantras. In truth the sacrament belongs to every conception, but it has a special usefulness in the case of the first.[1]

In the true consecration, the idea is the complete mergence of the I in the This: The I is nothing, even the word I is not; all is included in the This.

There is need, here also, to consider the auspicious muhūrṭa, time, and to observe certain rules of injunction and prohibition. The science of Jyoṭiṣha determines that the union of man and woman, after the monthly period, on a particular day and at a particular time, lagna, nakṣhaṭṭra, conjunction of planets, etc., has a special result in the nature and sex of the child.

During the first pregnancy, the union of husband and wife, after the conception, is forbidden. In subsequent pregnancies, Kāma-shāsṭra allows it. The condition of women is uneasy during the first pregnancy; their vital energy is diminished in an exceptional degree

[1] The difference between this rite and that of garbhāḍhāna is not very clear; probably this is concerned more with the parents, and that more with the embryo; that is the first sacrament in life and this the thirteenth in that same life now grown from embryo to parent.

because of the unaccustomed drain on it for the support of the fœtus. Union under these circumstances is pleasureless to both, and only when the due rasa, taste, relish, enjoyment, can be properly achieved is such union happy. Utter abstinence and the consequent entire absence of rasa breeds its own troubles on the other hand. To obviate all these the performance of this sacrament is necessary.

(*n*) The fourteenth sacrament is the janana-vraṭa, the 'birth-vow,' which takes place immediately after the birth of the child. There is rejoicing on the occasion because of the fulfilment of the wish for 'increase,' expansion, multiplication, which is the supreme wish of all. Even Mahā-Vishṇu rejoices at the birth of the first son. Whatever promotes the work of the *Praṇava*, in any aspect, of Aham, or Eṭaṭ or Na, promotes rejoicing. The piṭṛs also rejoice, for they are the regulators of the continuing succession, *i.e.*, the 'restoration' and expansion, of the family. Indeed, the param-parā, the succession 'one after another,' is the family. And of all such successions there are regulators and maintainers, and they are called the family ḍevas, kula-ḍevaṭā, the lares and penates. There is also an āchārya, guide, preceptor. assigned to each param-parā, to see to its maintenance and expansion. The maintenance, uḍḍharaṇa, 'up-holding,' consists in the

constant care-taking: This custom has always been observed in this family; it is observed now; it should be observed in the future also, etc. The expansion should be understood in the light of Mahā-Vishṇu's rule of multiplication. Such āchāryas are ṛshis, mahāṭmās, brāhmaṇas, etc. They all are the family piṭṛs, and the reason for their rejoicing is obvious. The foundation of all things in this samsāra is the work of Brahman (*i.e.*, the continuance of the World-process, activity, or multiplication.[1]) So when a new child is born and the World-process receives another turn of the wheel, they think: This person has got a son; the son will discharge the duties of the world; he will make a new multitude; he will attain knowledge and do ḍharma; to him there will come the consciousness Aham-Eṭaṭ-Na. The giving of this satisfaction to the piṭṛs is piṭṛ-ṭarpaṇa; but complete satisfaction comes to them only when Brahman (in the aspect of the unification of all beings) is realised.

[1] Compare the current verse बृहत्त्वाद्बृंहणत्त्वाच्चात्मैव ब्रह्मेति गीयते, "because of its immensity, bṛhaṭṭva, and because of its endless expansion, bṛmhaṇa, the Āṭmā, the Self itself, is called Brahman," (which word is derived from the root bṛh, to grow.)

Hence the advice to perform the nānḍī-mukha-shrāḍḍha, 'the happy-faced rite,' on the occasion. It consists in bringing satisfaction to all beings as far as lies in one's power, in giving out of one's superfluous possessions, in the overflow of joy, to others wanting them. The making complete of the incomplete, with shraḍḍhā, faith, is shrāḍḍha. Whatever is done with faith is shrāḍḍha; and only that is done which has not been already done; and that which has not been done is the incomplete, and hence the completion of it is fitting and proper, though, in verity, all is ever done and ever complete. Nanḍa is expansion, (also, joy); the condition or state of nanḍa is nānḍī. The shrāḍḍha that is done for the mukha, the face, the front, the sake, thereof, is nānḍī-mukha-shrāḍḍha[1].

The external formality is the offering of the sacrificial ball, havya-pinda. By such offering all beings are benefited; receiving that manṭra-enveloped ball they rejoice exceedingly.

---

[1] The modern interpretation of the word shrāḍḍha is the same; but nānḍī-mukha is construed somewhat differently as the 'piṭṛs whose faces are *glad*,' thereby meaning either the ordinary piṭṛs on a special occasion of rejoicing or certain special classes of piṭṛs, the 'glad-faced'; an offering to such is the nānḍī-mukha-shrāḍḍha.

In the true form, the idea is 'the appearance of the I in the This,' the consciousness 'I am' in the 'This'. It is true that the I and the This are not separable, still the consciousness here is of the nature of a regarding of them as substratum and attribute, supporter and supported, because they appear in one organism; saṭṭā, being, is the whole aḍhi-karaṇa, it is the only aḍhi-karaṇa, also it is only an aḍhi-karaṇa, substratum, forum, class or category, or common instrument of working or cooperation and unification—as the *Nyāya* declares.

This sacrament applies principally to the birth of a male child; but strictly it applies to both male and female children.

After this sacrament, comes the fifteenth, when the householder has finished all the duties of the household-life in the course of years, and appointed his son to carry on that work.

(*o*) The fifteenth sacrament is nivarṭana, retirement. It applies to the ḍampaṭī, the pair, both husband and wife. The etymological significance of the latter word is that the pair, after ḍamana, conquest, of personal desires, surrender themselves to and are established in the paṭi, the lord and master, the supreme Self[1].

[1] This etymology is not recognised by modern Samskṛṭ grammar. Apparently all the sacraments,

This sacrament signifies that the pair having understood the All and the All-pervading, relinquish one kind of work, *viz.*, that of the household, and take up another, for entire renunciation of all activity is impossible. They now constantly ponder only the Na, and so pondering roam freely over the surface of the earth wishing well to all the World-process. In the true form the idea is: 'Not I, Not This'.

The formal ceremony represents this idea. The proper times for all these various sacraments are also indicated by the Logion itself, as childhood, youth and age, respectively, corresponding to the Self, the Not-Self, and the Negation. Sub-divisions give us seven ages, *viz.*, those of the infant, the child, the boy, the youth, the middle-aged, the old, and the dying. They are connected with cognition, desire, etc. (The first three sacraments belong to the pre-natal

---

from marriage onwards, apply to the married pair jointly. That this fact is mentioned particularly in connexion with the fifteenth sacrament and not with the others, seems to be due to the presence of the possibility that a careless person might misunderstand 'retirement' from the household as justifying the abandonment of the wife by the husband even against her wishes. Manu expressly ordains that unless the wife herself wishes to stay behind in the 'household' with her children, she too shall be taken to the 'forest'.

condition; the next five to that of infancy, boyhood and brahmacharya; the next six to that of youth, middle-age and gārhasṭhya; the fifteenth seems to cover old age and vānaprasṭha, and partly sannyāsa also. While the sixteenth, as will appear presently, covers decrepitude and death and sannyāsa.)

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER VI (*continued*). Sub–Section (vii)

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE YAJUR-VEḌA.

The sixteenth sacrament, post-mortem rites.

(*p*) The sixteenth sacrament is maraṇa, death. Having finished all its work and exhausted all its energy, the jīva abandons the body.

Two kinds of kriyā, action, activity, are generally recognised, ākrashtaṭā and manḍatā, tension and relaxation. The former accomplishes work; the latter is powerlessness or gradual decay and disappearance of action. During the performance of work the jīva's energy is tense. He has acquired it in some way, and that way is this. The man engaged in active work becomes gradually slower and then entirely fatigued and exhausted as the work is completed. During that time of laxness and fatigue and, finally, rest, the work performed 'matures'. The maturing produces new energy. Then work begins anew, and so on, endlessly. Thus after eating (food, earned by work), sleeping follows, as is recommended. During the sleep the food produces fresh energy, and the man rises with powers renewed and performs

work afresh with success while those powers last. The process of birth and death, creation and dissolution, is the same. Activity begins with birth; when the work of life is finished, 'slowness,' mandaṭā, relaxation, supervenes to allow of the maturation of the work. That slowing down is maraṇa, the act of dying or death. When no more power for work is left in this sṭhūla body, then it is abandoned by the jīva. 'The powerless and therefore useless should be abandoned'—is the common saying. Thereafter, the 'maturation' of the actions done in the sṭhūla or gross physical body, *i.e.*, the experiencing and assimilation of their consequences, takes place in the sūkṣhma or subtle body. 'Slowness' supervenes in the sūkṣhma body also in the course of time, and then the activity is transferred to the kāraṇasharīra, the causal body; 'this' body is never abandoned (within the limits of one great cycle). New power is derived therefrom and new sūkṣhma and sṭhūla bodies are put on successively and thus birth on the physical plane takes place afresh. These three bodies, physical, subtle and causal, correspond to the Self, the Not-Self and the Negation.

When the sṭhūla becomes 'slow,' the jīva passes into the sūkṣhma, and this passing itself is dying. Hence the statement that, after death, the jīva goes to the abode of Yama.

Yama is n i v ṛ ṭ ṭ i, in-verting, re-verting, renunciation. The abode thereof is the s ū k ṣ h m a-ḍ e h a. Renunciation comes only after pursuit, p r a v a r ṭ a n a; the j ī v a, retreating, retiring from the pursuit of sense-objects by means of and in the physical body, turns elsewhere. This elsewhere is the s ū k ṣ h m a body and it is the y a m-ā l a y a, the abode of Yama. Confined there, the j ī v a dwells in Kāma-loka, the 'world of desire,' and experiences subtle actions (*i.e.*, either performs actions with the subtle body or experiences the fruits of sinful thoughts, *i.e.*, actions committed in thought during the physical life). Such experience is painful, whence the name and significance of n a r a k a, (etymologically, 'the little, contemptible, evil or worthless man,') the nether world, purgatory. The world of k ā m a n ā or desire is k ā m a-l o k a. The evil desires indulged in here in the gross body are 'considered,' digested, reflected or dwelt on, there. Hence many regrets and sorrows. Abandoning that subtle body again the j ī v a passes on to Svarga in the k ā r a ṇ a body.[1]

[1] The reader may discern some discrepancy between the text here and the statements on the subject in other theosophical literature. Different seers and different systems of metaphysic and practical Yoga have propounded schemes of bodies and planes which vary more or less from each other. At the present stage of public knowledge it is not easy to

Svarga is happy. The kāraṇa is the āṭma-

reconcile them all with each other or to say determinately that any one of them is positively incorrect. But there is a general agreement that there are such gradations of bodies and planes, and an agreement of the majority, in India, that a scheme of three bodies, sṭhūla, sūkṣhma and kāraṇa, dense, subtle and causal, and of planes or worlds corresponding to them, is the most intelligible and useful for the practical purposes of yoga. This scheme of three bodies may be regarded as the primary, and in accordance with the primal Trinity as said here. The next in degree of practical importance would be the scheme of seven, arrived at by permutations and combinations of the primal three. The *Praṇava-vāḍa* mentions septenates of various kinds repeatedly, amongst them seven sheaths or bodies, but not always by the same names. Current Veḍānṭa has one scheme of five koshas side by side with the scheme of three bodies. Theosophical literature, which has naturally undergone modification and also passed through a process of clarification and growth of ideas on this among other subjects, while accepting the three bodies as the fundamental fact, gives seven sub-divisions—a gross body, an ethereal double, an astral body, a lower mental body, a higher mental or causal body, a buḍḍhic body, an āṭmic or nirvāṇic body—and refers to still subtler or higher planes. All this at first sight is apt to be confusing, especially as to the why of all this multiplicity of bodies within bodies. An attempt to

ḍeha.[1]

The import of all these observations is simply that there is no entire cessation from activity to the jīva at any time, but only a cessation of one condition in the midst of an endlessness of conditions, a single determination in an endless general indeterminateness. Such a cessation is the sacrament of death. The (sub-conscious) rejoicing thereat is due to the expectation of the birth of fresh power. But because of the predominant manifestation of the Negation, grief is more manifest. The combination of This with Not, meaning the destruction of the This (more prominently than the creation of the Not with its hidden affirmation of new forms) gives rise to grief.

---

ascertain this why has been made in *The Science of Peace*, (pp. 125, 210, 211, 318) and will further be made in future notes in this work. (See foot-note near the close of the last Section, VI). In the meanwhile the triple division stands undisputed as primary.

[1] This seems to mean that the cause of the fact that Svarga is happy is that the kāraṇa body is the āṭma-body, the body in which the Self, which is bliss, is predominant, or, in other words, that for the purposes of this cycle, the causal body is, for all practical purposes, the innermost core and the immortal Self itself.

This maraṇa or death is san-nyāsa, as nivarṭana or renunciation is vāna-prasṭha, as pravarṭana or pursuit is gārhasṭhya, and as sampāḍana or accumulation and preparation is brahma-charya, corresponding to cognition, desire, action and summation. What is known as sannyāsa with reference to the scheme of life, is maraṇa with reference to the scheme of sacraments.

The ordinance is that the dead body should be burned. Because of the constant connexion between the sūkṣhma and the sṭhūla, the jīva dwelling in the sūkṣhma-body wishes to come back to this world from Kāma-loka, and if the gross body continues to exist though dead, it may come back in an abnormal and unhealthy way. This is the way that mischievous preṭas, vampires, incubi, succubi, etc., arise. In Kāma-loka, the jīva continues to revolve in memory the objects it longed for formerly on earth, and endeavours to return to the gross body in order to enjoy them[1]. Many serious

[1] A difficulty may occur here. As in the physical world, desires manifesting in the physical body reach out to and are gratified by physical objects so those in the astral body should correspond with astral objects; how is it then that the desires of the astral entity remain attached to physical objects and, impossible to gratify, become a means of pain and expiation? The explanation seems to be this:

troubles would arise from such a state of things, if it came about. To prevent it the lifeless gross body is cast into the fire.

Even after the destruction of the gross body, there remains another, the liṅga-ḍeha, type-body, which is similiar to the former in shape. This is included in the sṭhūla during life. And earthly objects can be enjoyed with this(alone, also); things greatly craved can be reached by it. Thus, we see in the case of dreams, that distant objects are reached with the liṅga-ḍeha, if greatly longed for, Or again, persons in different places in the physical body come together (in the liṅga-body). All *objects* exist in space; desire to obtain them links subjects to space, and space is entered into or traversed (quickly?) by means of the liṅga-ḍeha.[1]

In the ordinary human being, the jñānenḍriyas and karmenḍriyas have their *centres* in the astral body and their *organs* in the physical; and, similarly, the fully developed astral being has his sensor and motor *centres* in the mental body and the organs, for the enjoyment of astral objects, in the astral body. In the midway condition of the preṭa, the centres are present in its astral frame, and he feels corresponding desires also; but there are no developed organs yet; hence disappointment and pain. (A.B.)

[1] See footnote in this chapter, p. 272 *infra*, attempting to reconcile discrepancies as to ḍehas and lokas.

Hence we find that in hatha-yoga, by means of the violent processes called kuñjara, etc., the jīva, while retaining connexion with the gross body, can put it off and go forth (in the subtler); and so, many troubles arise from the (posthumous persistence of the) liṅga-ḍeha also. This body too is abandoned according to karma.[1] Jīvas while occupying the liṅga-body wander about here on earth. After that they dwell in Kāma-loka. Therefore should the gross body, when deprived of its own legitimate inspiring force, be cast into the fire. This is the ḍāha, cremation, and it is intended only to ward off the possible troubles mentioned above.

The jīva (that is passionate and full of unsatisfied appetites) is angered by the cremation of the body, and dwells in the burning-ground in his liṅga-body thereafter. The cremator comes away from the burning-ground. There is danger to him from the jīva. The desire (of the jīva for return to his ordinary physical life) is the source of the danger, though (the jīva) stays in the burning-ground. If the cremator stayed in the burning-place (and the dead jīva were especially violent) he too might be killed. On these facts is based the device mentioned in the *Ṭanṭra-shāsṭra* (dealing with

[1] Either the jīva's karma in the sense of merit and demerit, or vaiḍika karma in the sense of ritual prescribed for funeral ceremonies.

such practices) that japa should be made in the burning-ground to 'bind' a preṭa and secure its services (for purposes usually of black magic). The preṭa is gratified by the japa, and desirable objects, such as it coveted in physical life, are offered to it. In such practices, it should be remembered that if the performer allows himself to be frightened, then his fate is miserable indeed. He suffers death or complete madness or some minor harassment. Because of such dangers the cremator carries iron [1] on his person, for a certain number of days. After the cremation comes the asṭhi-sañchaya, the collection of the bones; it consists in the casting into water of the ashes and the remnants of the bones. If these are not cast into the water, the angered preṭa can cause much mischief even with the ashes, and diseases may arise therefrom also. Hence it is very necessary to throw them into running water. The preṭa seeing the ashes thrown away, goes (*i. e.*, endeavours to go) with the cremator; to prevent this, it is 'fixed' to some place outside the town or the house with the power of manṭras. Even the most

1 A piece of sharp iron, like a knife, or pointed, like a dagger, is usually thus carried, now-a-days. The reasons may consist in the merely psychological *idea* of confidence associated with the possession of a weapon of offence and defence; or in some superphysical properties belonging to the metal.

powerful preṭa is subject to such power. While the preṭa remains unsatisfied, endeavours have to be made continuously to bring it contentment, *e.g.*, by ghata-sṭhāpana, the setting apart of a jar, whereby water and food are offered to it, and by ḍīpa-ḍāna, the offering of light, etc. If such things are done and the preṭa gets the piṇdas, etc., he gradually forgets his connexion with the gross body, and is 'satisfied.'[1]

Hence the shrāḍḍha, offering of the ḍashagāṭra-pindas, wherein each offering of one pinda, ball of rice-paste, severs the preṭa's connexion with one of the ḍasha-gāṭras, the ten limbs (or parts of the body)[2]. Six pindas are offered before the cremation, also; their purpose is to accomplish

---

[1] The text here seems to apply mostly to very unevolved persons, laborers, etc., of a low type, or very selfish people of a more evolved sort. (A. B.)

[2] The manṭras used nowadays at this rite aim at *forming* the ten 'limbs'; the reconciliation is probably that they destroy the connexion of the jīva with the grosser physical and etheric and help to form the corresponding limbs of the sūkshma or subtle body, at first the lower astral, or the preṭa body of theosophical literature.

(It is an interesting coincidence that the Egyptian ritual for the dead, makes the dead man gather up his limbs on the other side of death.—A. B.)

the detachment of the jīva from the coveted objects of the household. These are offered in the order of cognition, action and desire, and thereupon the jīva casts off his craving for household objects, being drawn away from them by his wish for these pindas[1] and by the attraction of the dead body, too, from the house to the burning-ground. This makes up the offering of the sixteen pindas.

Besides this, another single pinda is offered, before the cremation, in the burning-ground, as representing the samāhāra, the totality of cognition, desire and action; this shrāḍḍha is performed by means of the samāhara-manṭra. After this and the ḍasha-gāṭra, the eleventh pinda should be offered on the eleventh day, for love of which the preṭa remembers not the gross body any more; this ekāḍashāha offering, on the eleventh day after death, is made with the smaraṇa-vīnāshana manṭra that 'destroys the memory'. On the eleventh day, the vṛṣh-oṭsarga, the 'setting free of the bull,' is also performed. This too tends to the

[1] The essence, aroma, or subtle aura of these piṇdas, even though, in themselves, they may not be very attractive objects, would reach the jīva by the power of the manṭras and so bring him positive gratification, while his craving for the other objects would be less capable of gratification; hence the drawing away from the one to the other.

satisfaction of the preṭa. The bull is given away, to some one as a gift, or is simply set free, in order to secure the release of the preṭa from his unhappy state. The Lord of the preṭa-world, dwelling in Kāma-loka, is also pleased with gifts of bulls.[1] 'Obtaining' the fruit of, *i.e.*, by virtue of such a gift, the preṭa casts off his liṅga-ḍeha quickly. Such is 'the deliverance from the condition of the preṭa.'

[1] The exact significance of this rite is not clear. One may note, in a general way, that each human race has its pet animal or animals. Thus, the horse and the dog are pets with the present fifth sub-race of the fifth Race, *viz.*, the European races; and the cat and the crocodile were the favourites of the Egyptians; so the bull and cow seem to have been connected with the Indian people, the first sub-race of the fifth Race, in a characteristic way (though the representatives of all other main types of animals are also included in the Hinḍū pantheon, as the 'vehicles' of the several chief gods and godesses, with that 'comprehensiveness' which is the chief characteristic of the Hinḍū ḍharma.) The cause of such connexions would be found in the subdivision of all things whatsoever, according to the all-pervading principle of the 'rays,' castes, or guṇas. The setting free of a bull, as *nullius res*, to improve and multiply the race of this indispensable animal in India, would in itself be an act of merit as a direct service to the public, and so help the jīva, the merit being voluntarily transferred to his

S h a y y ā - ḍ ā n a, the giving of bedsteads, etc., (on the eleventh day) is intended to win comfort for the jīva in Kāma-loka. Things given away here in the gross form are gained in Kāma-loka in the subtle form. Manṭras convert them into that subtle form. All the beings of this world dwell for a time in Kāma-loka, and, while there, remember their loved ones, their friends, etc., of the earth; and where there is memory there is actual relationship, and therefore the performance of these acts of charity, etc., is right and helpful[1].

---

credit by his earthly progeny, who perform the act, by means of manṭras. There may be besides, subtle magnetic effects such as those hinted at in the text. Thus, one theosophical explanation of rebirth in a lower kingdom is that an exceptionally depraved jīva which, even after having evolved to the human stage, retains bestial habits, is now and then tied to an animal body which has its own animal-jīva-tenant also all the while. It is quite possible that the bull-calf 'set free' in connexion with funeral ceremonies might serve some such purposes in cases now and then; though, now, it is more a matter of routine than of discrimination.

[1] These observations may help us to realise what amount of basis of fact there is in the practices of savages who slaughter relations, friends, servants, animals, at the death of their chiefs in order that they may keep the latter company; as well as in the gentler practices of more peaceful and organised

Thereafter comes the ḍvāḍash-āha-viḍhi, 'the ritual of the twelfth day,' in accordance with the rule of the sixteen samskāras. Sixteen piṇḍas are offered thereat; hence the name shoḍashī-shrāḍḍha. This shrāḍḍha has reference to the brahmacharya and other āshramas, stages of life, and the work (thereof, including the sixteen samskāras?) and is intended to bring about the abandonment of desire for or attachment to them, by the preṭa. It is true that they are renounced as soon as the body is renounced; but the constant practice, the habit, of them, through a long period of time, impresses them on the liṅga-ḍeha strongly and causes a fruitless and painful yearning.

For similar reasons we have the other shrāḍḍhas, of the first, the second, the third month etc., (up to the twelfth ?). The word 'monthly' here indicates avasṭhā, condition; there are sixteen such conditions or stages after death. Hence we have the offering of the sixteen

---

peoples like the Egyptians, Indians, etc., who offered and still offer bloodless help to their departed. The former would seem to be only the ferocious and fearful exaggeration and degeneration of the latter, appearing during the decay, the 'involution,' the diseased senility of dying races.

Actual relationship by *memory* is very significant and explains theosophical views on the subject.

pindas, shoḏasha-pinda. After this, the preṭa abandons the town, and its liṅga-ḍeha breaks up rapidly. This liṅga-ḍeha is the embodiment of lok-eṣhaṇā, desire for the world; its form is like that of the gross body; and, after the death of the latter, it passes through the sixteen conditions mentioned before, for the gradual abandonment of which a pinda is ordained each month. This monthly offering should be made in accordance with the condition of the liṅga-body, at the times prescribed as most favourable to the dissolution of that condition, and at the time of the final casting off of the liṅga-body the yearly pinda should be offered. The ordinary length of life of the liṅga-ḍeha is one year after the destruction of the gross body; hence the extension of post-mortem ceremonies over one year. Thereafter the jīva goes in the sūkṣhma-ḍeha into Kāma-loka. But, by special means, the liṅga-ḍeha may be dissolved even at the same time as the sṭhūla; and, again, sometimes it lives for many years, in exceptional cases. The liṅga-ḍeha is called the preṭa and the Liṅga-loka is the Preṭa-loka[1].

---

[1] There may well appear to the reader a serious discrepancy between the text here and current theosophical views. The latter aver that the ethereal double can be separated from the gross-body

Altogether, fifty pindas are offered in the course of the funeral rites. The pinda (the first one ?) of the burning-ground is not counted, as it is intended for one's (*i.e.*, the cremator's) own release (from pursuit by the preṭa) and not for the helping of the preṭa. The fifty

---

during life only in the most exceptional cases, and that too for a very short time, and that it does not survive the disintegration of the gross body more than twenty-four hours at most. The text here says, on the contrary, that its normal term of separate existence is a whole year. The reconciliation will be found perhaps, in the view that the liṅga-ḍeha here does not mean only the ethereal double but also the lower astral body of theosophical literature. The distinction between the lower astral body and the higher astral body is not yet made there either with much clearness, but it is being recognised more and more. (See foot-note, p. 260, *supra*).

I have said above 'does not mean .... only but also,' because it cannot be said that it means wholly and only the latter. It seems to me that this is the case with the names of all bodies, graded one with or within another. They pass from one to another, as ice to water and that to steam, in a manner which makes it difficult to say precisely where the one ends and the other begins. Hence the somewhat unsettled condition of the terminology. Indeed, in strictness, this is the case with all objects whatever; nothing can be rigorously defined and marked off from other

are made up thus: Six before the cremation, ten of the ḍasha-gāṭra, one of the ekāḍash-āha, sixteen of the shoḍashī-shrāḍḍha, sixteen of the sixteen (monthly) shrāḍḍhas, and finally one of the vārṣhika or annual shrāḍḍha[1].

---

things, finally, though the predominant characteristic helps us to do so for practical purposes with regard to most things. As our knowledge of these bodies grows, our definition of them will grow more complete. In the meanwhile, we may provisionally assume that here liṅga-ḍeha corresponds with the lower astral body, which lives out its generally unhappy life in that region of Bhuvar-loka which is known as the Preṭa-loka, while the higher astral body, which may be said to correspond to part of the sūkṣhma-body of the text, dwells in the other region of that same Bhuvar-loka which is known as the Piṭṛ-loka or Kāma-loka. So it is said, earlier in this chapter, that the jīva dwells in Svarga-loka in the kāraṇa body. This also appears to differ from the theosophical view and should be reconciled with it in the same way, by distinguishing a lower mental body from a higher mental body, the former, according to theosophical literature, being prominent in Svarga and the latter latent.

[1] In modern Hinḍū life, there is some conflict of practice as regards these offerings, mainly as regards the times at which they should be offered. These times cannot always be observed in exact accordance with the old rules. The sixteen monthly

In the true form of this consecration, the idea is: The I and the This are both Not; the Not predominates and is the source of all; all is naught, all is Not. To realise all as Not—this is the death-sacrament. The bond between the I and the This is broken, and the mutual 'deliverance' is the occasion of rejoicing. The two become one (and so abolish each other, Self—Not-Self—Not). All this appearance of separateness and contradiction disappears. The (separate) knowledge of the I, the This, and the Not is 'burned' up in the complete knowledge, 'I-This-Not,' so that neither the I is, nor the This, nor the Not (by itself). Hence the jīva who knows this is also a preṭa, *i.e.*, prakarṣheṇa, supremely, iṭa, arrived, attained, accomplished. Prakarṣha here refers to prayaṭna, effort, for this supreme knowledge is gained by supreme effort only.

---

offerings, compressed into twelve months by the text itself, are often in actual fact, finished within half that time or even less, in many cases. There is also a shoḍashi performed on the 13th or the 16th day after death, in many families, and so on. The principles having been lost sight of, and the orderly scheme of life laid down by Manu being very much disturbed and changed, the practices based upon them have also naturally become uncertain.

The fifty pindas in this connexion mean the various combinations of I-This-Not (?).[1] The six pindas before cremation are the six permutations of cognition, desire and action (taken two at a time ?) each accompanied by the Not. The sama-āhāra-pinda or that offered at the burning-ground is the seventh, and corresponds to the combined activity of the six. Or taken in another way, we have the actor, the cause, the effect or work, the motive, the relation of these four, the following or working out or manifestation of that relation, and finally its destruction. The I is the actor; the particular 'this' in the I is the cause; the 'this' become (*i.e.*, become identified with) the I is the effect; ('May I become this and not this other' is the motive); the conjunction of I and this is the relation; 'I am this, this,' is the following out or manifestation or evolution; (I am) not (this, this, etc.) is the seventh (*i.e.*, destruction). (After all this there follows) again the I-This-Not-*am*, the connecting of the first three with the verb as, to be, (in consequence of which there is a reassertion of what has been denied, a rebirth, in endless succession). This itself is manyness. (Again) the sub-division of the three (by the same three) makes nine. That

[1] The text is here very obscure, and the translation is largely tentative in consequence.

which is beyond even these three (taken separately, *i.e.*, their summation and mutual abolition), the shūnya, the vacuum, the no-thing, where even the Not is not—that is the tenth, the supreme condition. These make up the ḍashagāṭra. Then again we have the work, the activity, of I, and Not-I, and Not; and this work is of four kinds, samyoga, viyoga, anuyoga, praṭiyoga, conjunction, disjunction, association or similarity, contrast or contraposition (?). (By the sub-division of these by themselves) we have the sixteen pindas. The eleventh day shrāḍḍha or pinda is the summation of all, the realisation of the underlying unity. After gaining satisfaction (thus there comes) pralaya, dissolution, reabsorption. That is the work of the Na. But after the pralaya, fresh power having been gained, new work is taken up. There never is a pralaya of the Whole at any one single time, but only a successive and endless gradation of pralayas, for all that is in *time* is successive. Out of this there again arises the performance of sixteen (offerings) because of the multiplication of the four, I, you, this and another. The annual pinda means the abandoning of the consciousness of these distinctions and the unification of all the four. Such are the fifty pindas in the aspect of knowledge.

Vṛṣh-oṭsarga, in this view, means the abandonment of the ever-bellowing bull of separateness, which first manifests in sound (in our system). Vṛṣhabha, the bull, is the sense of separateness, mine, thine, another's, and the 'casting away,' the 'letting loose,' of this is ordained by the science of the Self. So, the shayyā-praḍāna, the gift of a bed, a place of rest (to all beings, in our consciousness) is the service of all beings in consequence of the consciousness of their unity; for whatever is gained from the Self should be given away to and for the sake of all selves. He who knows himself as the Universal Self, he has no egoism, no wish, for his separate individual self, nor any wish for another separated, individual self, but only for duty, *i.e.*, all selves; no svārṭha, and no parārṭha, but only paramārṭha.

The feeding of brāhmaṇas and others is recommended at these sacraments; for according to the extent of his knowledge is the extent of the service that a jīva may claim, and brāhmaṇas are those who have most knowledge. They have risen above the distinction of my-self and another-self, of mine and thine, and know all as One[1]; hence the giving of food to them is meritorious. At the same time, because of the fullness of one's own knowledge, and the

[1] See the extant *Vajra-sūchī-Upanishaṭ*.

realisation of relationship with all beings, gifts should be made to all and not only to brāhmaṇas. Hence 'the supplying of nutriment to all' is also declared to be meritorious.

In the true form, the feeding of brāhmaṇas means association with those possessing knowledge. On the principle that mukṭi follows from knowledge of the Truth, the study of that Truth is itself the feeding and clothing and supporting of those that possess that Truth. They who are ever pondering on the Truth in this way are ever feeding brāhmaṇas.

Such then is the death-sacrament. Connected with this is the maraṇ-āshaucha, the impurity and segregation of the kinsmen and relatives of the deceased for a certain number of days after the death. What is contrary to nature, the non-fulfilment of the requirement of one's nature—this only is impurity, āshaucha; for what is pure to one is impure to another at the same time, and again, in succession, to the same person, and what is impure becomes the pure and *vice versa*. Impurity and purity are thus relative to time and place. Now, cremation means the destruction of the sṭhūla body, whence anger in the preṭa and fear in the cremator; this condition of fear is the impurity; and according to the perfection of the knowledge of the cremator is the littleness of the impurity.

Hence, the brāhmaṇa, devoted to jñāna, cognition, knowledge, is purified in ten days, because of the triplicity of each combination of cognition, desire and action (?). The kṣhaṭṭriya, devoted to action, becomes pure in twelve days, because of the summation (the further addition) of cognition and action. Kriyā and jñāna enter into combination and the vaishya is the locus of that combination, (*i.e.*, ichchhā); he, therefore, is purified in fifteen days. The shūḍra, 'resting on' service, becomes pure in a month after the performance of the required service. The release from fear of the preṭa by the performance of the ḍasha-gāṭra, is the purification.[1]

[1] The excellent sanitary results on the physical plane of such systematic segregation of families are patent, especially in the case of infectious diseases; and the more so when we remember that infectiousness is only a question of degree and not of kind, that *all* diseases, like even health, like passions, enthusiasms, panics, etc., are infectious, but some very much and some very little. But over and above this, there are the superphysical considerations mentioned in the text. To understand the connexion between the two we have only to call to mind the fact, now generally recognised, that fear is a predisposing cause of disease, being itself in turn the effect of a debilitated nervous system and unhealthy condition of body such as is favorable for development

Three more shrāḍḍhas are sproken of, ek-oḍḍishta, pārvaṇa, and sapiṇdana. The first 'having one object,' 'addressed to one,' is performed once every year, in the month and on the day of the death; the jīva derives comfort therefrom in Svarga and Kāma-loka by the power of word-sounds; the manṭra of this ceremony confers happiness in Kāma-loka. The second is in the nature of a prayer for the emergence of the jīva from Kāma-loka and the strengthening of the kāraṇa-body; it is offered at a parva, joint, junction-point, turning-point. The prayer is addresed to Vishveḍeva, the Lord of Kāma-loka: Do thou deliver him out of this world, he will do good work in Svarga. Vishve-ḍeva hears these prayers only at parvas, the junctions of seasons, special occasions, holy days. If there are no such offerings and prayers, the jīva dwells in the two places for the full term required by his karma. It is true that karma cannot be annulled in any case; but what is meant is that the consequent punishment is quickened and its period therefore shortened; this is the justification for the prayer.[1]

of the disease-microbe. A family possessed of 'knowledge' would ordinarily not allow itself to fall into such a condition, and so be able to throw of the 'impurity' more easily.

[1] It may also be said that the gifts and charities, etc., accompanying the prayer, help to balance the

In the true form, ekoḍḍishta and pārvaṇa refer to jñāna. The former is the uprising of the One I, its appearance everywhere. The combination of the I with another, in the world-procession, is the latter; for a parva is made by a joining of two. The Āṭmā is established thus; by this means; it is not born, nor ever dies, for such reasons; or is ever dying and being born—such reflexion is pārvaṇa-shrāḍḍha. To enhance love with and for all, as if they were

---

evil and sin committed by the jīva. That every jīva must suffer the due punishment of his sins, that there can be no 'forgiveness' of sins—requires to be construed in detail. For it is also true that love *can* share sorrow and so make it less, that Christ *can* atone vicariously, that the Ruler *can* forgive sins to the repentant. The exact physical counterparts are the payments of relatives' debts by other relatives, the remission of debts by rich creditors to submissive debtors, the pardon of criminals by imperial prerogative. The reconciliation is that in the endless chain of causes and effects, the infinite complications of Nature's Ledger of transactions between all jīvas that are but one Self, the relative who pays *for* another relative, the creditor who remits and forgives, the Christ who atones for others, the King who pardons is only paying back to the debtor, the sinner, the criminal, previous service rendered, to Self or country, or is now registering a loan to be recovered later.

one Self, to know with perfect faith that the Aṭmā is in all the parvas, *i.e.*, samsāras or worlds, centres, junction-places of jīvas and of planes of matter—this is pārvaṇa-shrāḍḍha.

Sapindana in the true form means samāna-pinda-karaṇa, 'same-body-making,' the co-ordination of all into one, (the reduction of everything, of all the World-process, into the Logion). Brahman is one; the many is not possible; manyness is nothing; the one is the many; the many is the one; nothing is destroyed, or becomes, or stays; destruction and stay are becoming; becoming is destruction and stay; those that have become, stay; those that are staying, dissolve; those that have dissolved, become again—the realisation of this order and succession running through all things is such coordination.

In the conventional form, sapindana is the yojanā, classing, joining, of the departed jīva with the father, the grandfather and the great-grandfather. Yojanā means the making over of the jīva to the hereditary rulers, the spiritual hierarchs of the family, the ṛṣhis, brāhmaṇas, etc., spoken of before, who are in the position of fathers, grandfathers, etc.[1] And this is done

[1] The experiences recorded in theosophical and in the better class of modern spiritualistic literature, go to prove the presence of 'office-bearers' in the 'invisible' worlds of the subtler planes who look

by means of manṭras: Behold, this jīva entereth into Kāma-loka and other worlds, do ye protect him. This ceremony is also known as piṭṛ-melana, the 'joining' with the ancestors Because of this inner significance is the ceremony performed even for those departed ones whose father, grandfather and great-grandfather may be living. The rites are the same for men as well as women; these are 'classed' with the mother, the mother's mother and her mother, etc.

Thus, then, these external ceremonies bring special results, physical and superphysical, in special kinds of pleasure or riddance from pain; but the real aim of all sacraments is to secure

---

after disembodied jīvas from the physical plane. The elaborate after-death ritual of Hinḍuism is intended to facilitate the work of these 'office-bearers' so far as possible. The physical devices, the use of fire and of running water, and there too of specially 'sacred' streams, etc., all becomes significant if we remember that the grosser and subtler worlds are not disconnected but correspondent, that they are always working in with each other, on principles of psycho-physical parallelism. Theosophical literature tells us that in the astral world the āpas-taṭṭva predominates; in the mental world, the agni-taṭṭva; therefore there are special contacts between these and the physical water and fire, etc., respectively.

the final illumination. And for this reason is it ordained that for those who have already passed through the fire of knowledge, no second cremation is needed, and s a n n y ā s ī s are not cremated in consequence. When the final knowledge has been gained, all sacraments are finished. All these sacraments are to be found hidden and taking place in every atom.[1]

---

[1] The modern reader might question why all this excessive elaboration—as it would seem to him—of rites and formalities which remain empty after all the author's attempts to put significance into them? And indeed have not the Hinḍūs themselves practically given up the bulk of them? For answer—to a questioner in whose mind the whole trend and setting of the line of thought contained in this work, has not wholly failed to touch some even slightly responsive chord—two considerations may be recommended:

(*a*) It may be that all the elaboration *had* its use in an earlier day, in training the mind, but that only a small portion of it has use now, and is being accordingly retained, while the rest has been or is being, given up by the Hinḍūs themselves. The ḍ h a r m a s change with the y u g a s, epochs and forms of civilisation—this is expressly recognised in the *Smṛṭis* themselves. A definite origin in time, at a particular stage of human evolution, for the s h r ā ḍ ḍ h a ceremony, is clearly described in the *Mahābhāraṭa*, indicating that the conditions of human constitution, in respect

Thus, then, these five mahā-yajñas, five meḍhas and sixteen samskāras, extending from birth to death; the life-activity of the jīva from this world up to Svarga; the cause of rebirth; the cause of reincarnation in special bodies; the re-experiencing of pleasures and pains; the mutual relation of objects and their origin; in short, the whole essence of kriyā or action, is described in the Yajur-Veḍa, together with the absolute necessity of the world-procession and its activity.

---

of physical and subtler bodies before that time were not such as to require shrāḍḍhas. And in some future day, as seems to be promised by 'spiritualistic' researches and developments, if conscious intercourse between the living and the dead, the 'embodied' and the 'disembodied,' should be fully established again, probably the present *form* of shrāḍḍha would have to become non-existent again. Briefly, with changes of the physical and superphysical conditions of the constitution of man and of his environment, changes take place in the 'sacraments' needed for the full living of his life. In earlier days these changes were deliberately made by 'acts of legislation' of recognised seers and divine kings, in whom people had faith; to-day they are brought about by instinctive struggles and revolutions between ruler and ruled who have little faith in and sympathy for each other.

The first m a ṇ t r a of the Yajur-Veḍa is i s h é-ṭ v a r j e[1]-ṭ v ā, etc. Beginning with this and up to the very end, the whole of k r i y ā is successively described in its relation to time and space, without which k r i y ā is not possible. These three, *viz.*, action or motion, time and space, themselves constitute 'process,' and by means of them is the work of B r a h m a n accomplished. Otherwise, indeed:

(*b*) The second consideration, practically a continuation of the first, is that much more elaborate s a m s k ā r a s—only not called by that name but designated 'social conventions'—are being created by the modern type of civilisation to replace the old ones. One reads in a journal of the day that a school has been established where young men are initiated into the mysteries of the art of using knives and forks, etc., correctly while eating in company—and so forth. As to whether the one set of 'initiations' is better, or the other, whether 'social conventions of etiquette' is a better name than 'sacraments,' whether the religious atmosphere and high and serious moral tone of the one is more elevating or more deadening and depraving to human nature, or whether the competitive wish to shine as first in everything is such—all this is matter of racial taste, itself governed by the general scheme of evolution—for 'new' races are mostly only new embodiments of the same j ī v a s, over and over again.

[1] The modern reading is ṭ v o r j e.

The Self transcendeth act and space and time.
This Ancient of all ancients needeth not
The offerings of yajñas small or great,
No vows or sacraments of triple thread,
Or piercing of the ear, or marriage-tie,
Or rite before or after birth or death.
Beyond all time and space It ever stands,
Beyond all reach of good or evil things,
I, This, and Not, a trinity in one,
A perfect Consciousness of Being and Bliss.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER VII. Sub–Section (i)

THE SĀMA VEḌA.

The nature of Shakṭi-Energy in general.—Distinction between Shakṭi, Ichchhā and Māyā.—Māyā and Brahman.—Mahā-māyā, and its sub-divisions, Yoga-māyā, Bhagavaṭī, Yoga-niḍrā.

After the *Yajuh* comes the *Sāma*, descriptive of all desire; and as desire connects cognition and action, so the *Sāma* connects the *Ṛk* and the *Yajuh*. Ichchhā is the energy of Shiva. It indeed is the energy, force, power, of all and everything that has any power; and it is everywhere, omnipresent; without energy relation between two things is not possible. The being together of two things is their relation; and for such relation, such bringing and keeping and being together, of two things, a third thing as connecting link is indispensable, a third which may hold the two together. Ichchhā is this third which brings together cognition and action; and this coming together of these is all work, all (the external, objective, real) World-process, the cognition-element being (the internal subjective, ideal) *Veḍa* which

is the ideation of Mahā-Vishṇu. All the 'behavior,' the 'operation,' of time, space, and motion becomes possible only by means of Shakṭi, and the World-process is but the proceeding forth of these three. That they are considered separately at all is only to secure fullness of treatment; in reality the three are but one.[1] Hence too the One Shakṭi of the whole World-process is the Brahman-Shakṭi which only *appears* threefold as Brāhmī, Vaishṇavī, and Shaivī. It may be said that only two shakṭis should be spoken of (those of cognition and of action, and not also a third, the shakṭi of desire, which would be tantamount to a 'power of power'), because desire is the one power divided in two by reference to cognition and action; still, because energy is definable only by its work, and because we *find* the three kinds manifesting in work, in the

[1] I have nowhere met in the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* a definite statement to the effect that space, time and motion are different forms or attributes of the negative aspect of the Na, and that Shakṭi, Energy, is its affirmative aspect, as is attempted to be shown in chapters xi and xii of *The Science of Peace*; but statements like these in the text here may be regarded as pointing to this. In the *Vishṇu Bhāgavaṭa* and Vyāsa's *Yoga-bhāshya* also, such expressions are to be met with as ḍesha-kāla-kriyā, or space-time-motion, and ḍesha-kāla-nimiṭṭa, or space-time-cause.

world, as a matter of fact, therefore we also find them dealt with in the *Sāma-Veḍa*[1].

A indicates the Vaishṇavī, U the Brāhmī, and M the Shaivī energy. The Vaishṇavī energy is the complement, converse or opposite, of kriyā, and of the nature of and in accord with jñāna. The Brāhmī energy is of the nature of kriyā and the converse of viḍyā, knowledge. The Shaivī energy is of the nature of the nexus between the two and gives rise to ichchhā.

---

[1] We may justify the three kinds thus: (i) energy as manifesting in cognition; (ii) as manifesting in action; (iii) as in itself, apart from manifestation, as mere desire or emotion.

Because of the endless interplay of 'inseparability' and 'distinguishability' and of the unremitting operation of the law of psycho-physical parallelism, we have the appearances of different psychical processes being predominantly connected with different organs and different kinds and planes of matter, in the world around and in the constitution of human individuals. Thus cognitive consciousness works predominently in one set of organs and one kind of matter, the desiderative in another, and the active in a third. See *The Science of Peace*, chapters xiii-xiv-xv; *The Trishikha-Brāhmaṇa Upaniṣhaṭ*; *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. III, last section, and *The Ancient Wisdom*, as to the predominance of one of the three aspects of consciousness in one plane of matter and corresponding sheath or body of the jīva.

We find the seven s v a r a s, musical notes, in the *Sāma.* In describing desire, the *Sāma* deals also with the sextette of j ñ ā n a and k r i y ā (mentioned before, through which desire manifests) and with their summation, the seventh; and the seven s v a r a s correspond to these seven. At first, in the *Samhiṭā* portion of the *Sāma,* we find only three s v a r a s, corresponding to the three energies. So too, in the *Ṛk* and the *Yajuh,* only the three s v a r a s are employed. The seven are developed only in the course of the exposition of i c h c h h ā through which alone all things are developed.

By studying the three v i ḍ y ā s, sciences, of cognition, action and desire, *Ṛk, Yajuh* and *Sāma,* which are all again developed in a new aspect in the *Sāma,* by itself, as the sciences of the three s h a k ṭ i s, and, finally, by studying the *Aṭharva,* the j ī v a secures the full fruitage of ḍ h a r m a, a r ṭ h a, k ā m a, and m o k ṣ h a, virtue, profit, pleasure and salvation, respectively.

S h a k ṭ i is the necessity of the conjunction of Self and Not-Self, of A and U, of cognition and action. Nothing takes place without necessity. Necessity is all becoming, inherent in and outcome of the S v a-b h ā v a, the nature, of the Absolute. As the *Nyāya* declares: All becoming is necessity. (All becoming, all the World-

process, all possible conjunctions and disjunctions of Self and Not-Self, are contained in the Sva-bhāva, and hence necessary; that Absolute-Nature is the one necessity which is its own reason and the reason and cause of all facts and contradictions which are within it and are it.) Anything, anywhere, all, not-all, other, this, all sounds, all times, all spaces, all cognitions, all actions, the known, the unknown, the done, the undone, the born, the unborn, the present, the non-present, the essence, the non-essence—all this *is*, hence *becomes*: such is the significance of becoming. That which does not become never comes into reckoning at all; it has no word or name for it, there is no consideration of its significance, no remembrance, no forgetting, no recollection of it, no certainty and no uncertainty about it, no possibility and no impossibility of it. The 'not' itself also is or becomes, for unless it became, there would be no such expression as na-iṭi, (or na-asti), so-and-so '*is* not'; there would be no conjunction between na and iṭi. 'Not this thing', 'not this person', 'not another', not thou', 'not I', 'is not', 'not is', 'no end', 'no beginning', 'no beginninglessness nor endlessness'—in all these expressions we see the conjunction of the 'not' or 'no' with other words. This conjunction itself is the *becoming* of the 'not'. Without

such conjunction there is no knowledge and no expression of it.

As the *Brahma-Sūṭra* declares: As (*i.e.*, is) is necessity. Beyond the *a s* is the Soundless, the Timeless, the Spaceless, the Differenceless. For these reasons, then, 'becoming' is necessity. Hence *all* is necessary. As the *Vaisheṣhika* declares: There is not anything that is not necessary. The unnecessary, the contingent, is also fashioned by the necessary, is necessary, is part of the contents of the S v a-b h ā v a. Therefore whatever becomes, and the operation of becoming also, is necessary. The *Sāṅkhya* also declares similarly: Is-ness, a s ṭ i ṭ v a, is necessity. The necessity of the (conjunction of the) 'not' and the 'is', and of the 'I' and the 'This'—all this is inherent in the Negation. Because of the principle that Necessity is s h a k ṭ i (s h a k, to be able or possible), *might*, power, energy, do we see that everywhere action arises out of (some) necessity, (a special need). Every-one, imposing upon himself, imagining, feeling, realising some need or necessity, performs some act according to the extent of his knowledge of the means of satisfying that need. This fact may be observed in the movements of every single atom. We see that such first questions, preliminary to acquaintance, as, How do you happen to come here? For what purpose? What

do you want? Who are you? Where do you live? all these really signify, What is the need or necessity that brings you here? By what necessary means have you come here? By what necessity are you staying in the place where you have put up? etc. For residence in any particular place has also its necessary reason, as, otherwise, the Self dwells everywhere and supports all. There is a necessity implied also in the question Who are you?, *viz.*, What is the necessity for your being what you are; why *you* in particular; there must be a reason, a need, a necessity for the knowing, the recognising of, the making of acquaintance with, you; otherwise, multitudes of people see and pass each other every day, and everyone does not ask every other such questions. In the question, For what purpose, pra-yojana? the reference to necessity is express. Pra-yojana means, etymologically, that wherein the self is engaged, conjoined; and that is necessary, otherwise the self would not be so assiduously engaged therein. Or, by another etymological explanation, that whereby one is impelled to or engaged in some activity is the pra-yojana; here 'that whereby' signifies 'by this necessity.' Otherwise, from the standpoint of Brahman, all is always 'impelled,' and there is no need for any specification of the impellor as 'he', 'which', 'that

one', 'which one', 'I', 'thou', 'all'. Hence, then, we must recognise necessity everywhere. As the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says repeatedly: Every question looks to a necessity, every question bases on a necessity (a reason, a compelling motive).

Therefore are all sounds or words necessary. Without necessity there is no thinking and no utterance of words—this is the view of the science of language, grammar, which further enjoins that the unnecessary, or redundant, and the irrelevant, or inconsistent, word should not be used, but only the well-directed, the necessary, and the easy to follow in thought. Let us consider further that no word exists for which there is not a necessity in its own proper time and space; the irrelevancy and undesirability lie only in the use of the word without due necessity; otherwise, shabḍa being Brahman, all words are relevant, correct, and of universal application. Hence does the *Aṅga-Sūṭra* say: The word should be regarded as based on necessity. And the science of *Chhanḍah*, metre, rhythm or prosody, declares: The word should be selected according to the needs or the necessity of the subject, *i.e.*, the subject-matter dealt with in the work, and of the order of the thought or meaning. The *Kalpa-Sūṭra* again avers thus: Thinking is, and is about the,

necessary. And that is the a r ṭ h a, the idea, the subject-matter thought about, the sense or meaning intended to be expressed. And, finally, the expressor of that a r ṭ h a is the word, the s h a b ḍ a. Hence is it declared everywhere that the action, aim or purpose, of 'ornaments of language' and 'ornaments of thought' is one and the same.[1] The 'ornament of thought' is the real, inner, necessity, *i.e.*, aim and purpose; the ornament of language is only an additional means of emphasising it. The poet who indulges in mere ornaments of language without an inner substantial ornament of thought is condemned by the science of poetry. Hence does the *Sāhiṭya-Sūṭra*, the aphorisms of rhetoric, say: The ornaments of language and of thought are inter-connected.

So is there the same reference to necessity in the advice that time should not be 'made useless' *i.e.*, wasted, which means that only that should be done at any particular time which it is *necessary* to do at that time; to do anything else is to make time useless, to waste it, and so is

[1] In English, the expression 'figures of speech' seems to cover both, 'ornaments of language,' *e.g.*, alliterations, onomatopœia, deliberate selection of soft-sounding or harsh-sounding words, and 'ornaments of thought,' *e.g.*, similes, metaphors, hyperboles, antitheses, etc.

reprehensible. Otherwise, indeed, time is without beginning and without end, and it is not possible to waste it; it is always passing, whether this thing be done or that other, your work or mine, and it can never be exhausted. But this *transcendental* consideration is not appropriate where *particular* business is in hand, in individual life; for, there, time once passed comes not back again, and even though time be indefinite or transcendent, taken as a whole, yet *within* it is a constant succession of definite 'appointed times,' *i.e.*, moments, periods, cycles, æons, assigned to and fixed for particular purposes. The 'appointed' is the necessary. *Within* the transcendent is the particular time, *this* time, appointed for each 'this.' If *this* does not become, *i.e.*, is not completed, within *this* period, beginning here and ending here, then that time has been wasted, and after it has lapsed, regret remains behind, for the necessity, the need, has not been fulfilled. If, on the other hand, the necessity has been fulfilled, then the lapse of the time leaves behind no regret, but a great satisfaction. Hence too is it clear that joy and sorrow also attend on necessity.

The science of *Jyoṭisha*, astrology, also declares that the calculation of time depends on the necessity of the work for which that calculation is required.

Thus do we see that all becoming is necessity; and becoming is nothing else than conjunction, inter-relation; and conjunction exists or subsists in a pair only; hence the necessity of the conjunction of the two, the *fact*, the deed-act,[1] of becoming (or the being and existence of the fact or process of becoming) is the third to these two. It is Shakṭi, *might*, energy, which is therefore called the *cause* of Samsāra.

This Shakṭi is the originator, reverser, and permuter of beginning, middle and end, and it inheres in the Logion, I-This-Not. The svarūpa, the own-form, of this Shakṭi is as, 'is.' Its manifestations are the affirmations: I am, I am this, I am not this, I am such, I am not such, how am I, why am I, why am I not, how am I not, I verily am, etc. Without the as, is or am, the Logion I-This-Not is nothing at all, is meaningless. (Thou) 'art' and (he) 'is' are also based on, derive their significance from, (I) 'am.' It is only on the strength of and with the consciousness 'I am' that one jīva says to another: Thou art, thou art this, thou art thus, etc. The case of 'is' is similar. Without the 'am' there is no speaker of the 'art' or 'is'; without a speaker there is no employment

[1] Compare Fichte's "Thatsache," and "That-Handlung" (Kroeger, xix). Professor Harris' introduction is very interesting in the light of the following (E. H. B.).

of the second or the third person (of grammar)[1]. In one sense, indeed, because the A h a m, I, exists everywhere, and a s, is, is everywhere inherent in it, therefore everyone becomes, in turn, according as he is the speaker, or listener or spoken about, the first, the second, or the third person. Thus, in truth, all is but a s, is, Necessity, and first, second, and third persons are nothing.

The 'am' is the Self, the 'art' is the This, the 'is' is the Not. This difference of persons arises because the thought or knowledge, I-This-Not, is present in everyone and everywhere, so that each one thinks 'I (am)-not-this,' and thus separates himself away as 'I,' including all the rest in 'this' and 'not'. Otherwise, indeed, all ḍ h ā ṭ u s, verb-roots, roots of action, are but one, *viz.*, to be, to become; and all action proceeds from and because of the root; hence all action is one[2]. That is to

---

[1] All this is only another but fresh and suggestive way of saying that *my*-consciousness, and, because there are ever so many *my*-consciousnesses each cognisant of others, therefore the one universal My-Consciousness or All-Self-Consciousness, is the necessary foundation of all individual consciousnesses whatsoever; it is the one sole proof and testimony of the existence of any and everything.

[2] The text is very obscure here and I am not quite sure of the accuracy of my translation.

say, there is but one noun, the 'I,' but one verb 'to be,' and but one unbroken action or motion in the whole of the world-process, *i.e.*, 'becoming,' the self-assertion of the Self in endless ways.

(The primal trinity has been repeatedly declared to consist of three factors, I, This, and Not. What is this Shakṭi, then; is it a fourth?[1]) It would seem as if it was outside the three. Yet this is not so. It is only the Necessity of the three and so included in them and not anything apart from them. That which is necessary to anyone is included in that one, is part of his being. In the moment that anyone is feeling the

[1] The question of the place of Shakṭi in the Logion is dealt with in a slightly different aspect, here, from that in which it is treated in the *The Science of Peace.* Possibly the reader may find it easier to follow the text here if he is familiar with the idea put forward there, *viz.*, that the *relation* of Negation between Self and Not-Self, because of the limitedness of the Not-Self, which makes *simultaneity* of affirmation and negation impossible, necessarily becomes a *successive* affirmation-negation; and this *necessary succession*, of affirmation and then Negation, is the real nature and form of Shakṭi, so that Shakṭi may be regarded as one aspect and Negation as the other of the third factor, *i.e.*, the Relation, which is immanent in the Self and Not-Self, or rather is immanent together with the Not-Self, in the Self.

necessity, the need, for anything, in that moment he is feeling himself as nothing else than, as nothing without, the object of his desire. (This is the inner significance of the ordinary expressions, 'his soul, his very being, is bound up with the loved object, without it he dies, is nothing.') It is true that from the position of the necessary or desired object, *i.e.*, when it has been attained, there will appear still another necessary or desired object further on in the distance, and this endlessly, but for the time being the consciousness of the desiror rests there, in the first desired object. (Consciousness is s a m-v i ṭ, that which 'knows well'). That which knows another well is itself knowable by that other; on this principle, the Ā ṭ m ā, the desiror, the Lover, becomes included in or with and non-separate from the desired object, the Beloved. Because the reality is one even when it appears as separate, because the necessity is its own necessity, therefore its own light or life is included, is present, in that which it thinks to be necessary to its own being; and hence only the pursuit of the desired by the desiror becomes possible and results actually. By the union of man and woman, progeny arises. The man is the first, the woman the second, the child the third. The *necessity*-bond of this triplet is k ā m a, love. This k ā m a is included in the three, and not outside of and apart from

them; it is *understood* when the three are referred to. Of course, in a verbal enumeration, k ā m a would be mentioned separately, but in reality, the whole of its existence is included in the existence of the three.

This one and the same Energy, in its supreme and universal aspect, is called S h a k ṭ i; in its non-supreme or subsidiary, particular, concrete, aspect it is called i c h c h h ā; in its all-transcendent, absolute aspect, M ā y ā. When we say that M ā y ā is nothing, we should remember that the 'no' belongs of necessity to M ā y ā.[1] The form and nature of necessity is no-thing determinate, but always indeterminate and transcendent, for necessity is all-transcending, beyond space, time, and action or motion. (That is to say, necessity being the changeless nature or S v a-b h ā v a of the Absolute, which is *Self-determined into all possible forms* in the World-process, there being no other determinor—it follows that this absolute necessity is absolute freedom or indeterminateness also; and again because it is essentially the negation of all affirmation of any and all possible particulars, therefore is it truly *no-thing* too).

[1] It may be that M ā y ā is the equivalent of what is described in *The Science of Peace* as 'S h a k ṭ i-energy as condition,' or time-space-motion. These three are emptinesses and M ā y ā is by Samskṛṭ etymology या मा, 'that which is not'.

But it may be asked: A difference is made everywhere between Māyā and Brahman; the counsel is constantly given that we should free ourselves from Māyā and become Brahman, that Māyā is the maker of separateness and we should therefore abandon it and realise Brahman; (how then can we say that Māyā is the necessity, the very nature of Brahman)?. The reply is: In this counsel, the word Māyā means something else than the Supreme Necessity; it means the separate, personal and particular forms of desire, the feelings of mine, thine, etc., created necessarily by the Self by means of nescience (the half-science, half-truth or error, included in the Whole Truth, Viḍyā), the fixed ideas that this only should be done, this avoided, this has been gained, this lost, this is certain and permanent, this uncertain, this desirable, this undesirable, and so on. The counsel means that we should rather think that (from the totality of all standpoints) all is desirable, all is thine, I am thou, (there cannot be anything that is exclusively) mine or thine, thou art I, another is I, I am another, all is necessary and preordained, all should be done, all is one, one is all, there is no one and many, all is everywhere and everywhen and everyway, all belongs to everything and everything to all; abandon that primitive māyā that is the personal desire of mineness and creates

separateness, and embrace instead the Supreme Māyā that is identical with Brahman, the one Necessity, the unified Trinity.[1]

As Shakṭi is sub-divided into Viṣhṇu's jñāna-shakṭi, Brahmā's kriyā-shakṭi and Shiva's ichchhā-shakṭi, so is Māyā also sub-divided into Yoga-māyā, Bhagavaṭī, and Yoga-niḍrā, corresponding to Viṣhṇu, Brahmā and Shiva respectively. The necessity whereby the conjunction of Aham with Eṭaṭ is brought about is yoga-māyā, the maker of the worlds, for without this conjunction there is no possibility of the existence of samsāra, and indeed the conjunction itself is called samsāra. Bhagavaṭī is connected with kriyā; bhaga is aishvarya, lordship, sovereignty, the wealth of action. It is the necessity of Eṭaṭ (which, because of the inherent limitedness of each eṭat, gives rise to succession). Yoga-niḍrā is the necessity of the Negation which brings about the disjunction of Aham and Eṭaṭ, and so the dissolution of

[1] In the language of practical social ethics, 'Do not remain passionately wedded to particular opinions, holding all others in error—which egoism is the quintessence of prejudiced bigotry; but learn to take broad-minded and tolerant views, seeing that even the most divergent opinions and doctrines have *some element* of the One Truth in them. See *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 282, foot-note.

worlds; it is that which *sleeps* in or brings to sleep the conjunction of I and Not-I. The summation of these three is the Mahā-māyā (in a general metaphysical sense; but it has a particular sense also, *viz.*,) it or she is the shakṭi of Mahā-Vishṇu the lord of the mahā-manvanṭara, the cycle of this samsāra. Strictly, of course, this shakṭi is not a possession, a private belonging, of Mahā-Vishṇu. There is only one Necessity or energy which receives various graded names of great, small, etc., according to the grades of the various agents through whom it manifests. All other similar names (and metaphysical words) should also be interpreted similarly, everywhere and always, as having a double significance, one personal and particular and the other impersonal or universal and transcendental.[1]

[1] In connexion with Mahā-Māyā, apparently to illustrate the two meanings mentioned in the text, the author quotes a shloka, from the current *Durgā-Sapṭa-shaṭī*, as to how by the special grace of Mahā-Māyā, Sāvarṇi became the eighth Manu and the ruler of a manvanṭara. In commenting upon the verse the ṛshi makes a number of statements as to occult cycles, etc., which are very obscure. Some figures have been given before, in the 2nd chapter of the 3rd Section as to cycles and worlds and world-rulers; they too, it will be remembered, are not easy to synthesise. Making a rough guess as to the author's meaning, it seems to be that

7^5 manvanṭaras or 7^4 mahā-manvanṭaras make the vinihiṭa-cycle which is the lifetime of our Sun (?), who is the body of Mahā-Vishṇu; that in this particular mahā-manvanṭara of fourteen Manus,—the 7th of which Manus, *viz.*, Vaivasvaṭa is now ruling us in the 4th Vaivasvaṭa-manvanṭara and the 28th viyuga,—by some special ordainment of the individual goddess Mahā-Māyā, the consort of Mahā-Vishṇu, Sāvarṇi becomes the 8th and most important Manu, apparently exercising some authority over the whole of the seven manvanṭaras, retrospective and prospective, and over all the other thirteen Manus, being in some special manner, the special son of Sūrya, the Sun. It may be asked what is the difference between Shakṭi and its three sub-divisions of jñāna-shakṭi, kriyā-shakṭi and ichchhā-shakṭi (or, as they are called in their personal aspect, Vaishṇavī, Brāhmī, and Shaivī), on the one hand, and Māyā or Mahā-Māyā and its three sub-divisions of Yoga-māyā Bhagavaṭī and Yoga-niḍrā, on the other. Apparently only the difference between dynamic and static aspects of the same energies; the former series of names gives prominence to the active or manifested aspect; the latter to the potential and self-contained one. Or, it may be said that the difference is that between the universal and the particular, the generic and the specific; somewhat like that between saṭ-chiḍ-ānanḍa and kriyā-jñāna-ichchhā, or between saṭṭva-rajas-ṭamas and guṇa-karma-ḍravya. See the opening sentences of the next chapter also.

SECTION III. (*Continued*).

CHAPTER VII. (*Continued.*)—Sub-Section (ii).

THE SĀMA-VEḌA.

Particular forms of Shakṭi-Energy.—Sarasvaṭī Lakṣhmī, Saṭī.—Their summation in Paramā.—Their sub-divisions.

Yoga-māyā, etc., are the universal aspects of Energy, based on I-This-Not, and present in each single atom; but the individual shakṭis of the rulers of this world are Lakṣhmī, Sarasvaṭī and Saṭī. The order just mentioned is the principal order, but they may be taken in any other order, Sarasvaṭī, Lakṣhmī, Saṭī or Saṭī, Lakṣhmī, and Sarasvaṭī, etc. Sarasvaṭī is devoted to cognition, Lakṣhmī to action, and Saṭī to desire.

Brahmā, the upholder of action, is, however, entirely powerless to perform any action without the power of cognition; action without knowledge is not possible; hence he takes Sarasvaṭī as his help-mate. Again, the power of cognition is ineffective and useless without the power of action; hence Viṣhṇu takes Lakṣhmī for consort. Because of the conjunction between I and This, and the mutual dependence of cognition and action, these two powers are

exchanged between Brahma and Viṣhṇu. The Self is knowledge; in order to conjoin with the Not-Self, action, it needs the energy thereof; and *vice versa*. That which unites with another takes on the powers, the work, and the time-cycle or life-period of that other. So long as there is not a complete co-ordination and unity in all these three respects there is no possibility of a conjunction, there is no *is-ness*, existence, reality, in the conjunction. This is the significance of the ceremony of marriage, which is the imitation, in the outer world (of these divine marriages). In a sense, all women have the same sva-bhāva, nature (*i.e.*, femininity); all have the same limbs, and the same work or function and so are one; yet, by difference of situation, they, each, have different relations with different persons: the wife of one—the daughter of another, the daughter of one—the wife of another, and so on. Throughout, however, wifehood is the principal element in the nature of woman generally; the inner principle whereof is only the conjunction of I and This. As the *Brahma-sūṭra* declares: Yoga, conjunction, union, is the mutual completion of two in-completes.

Finally there is the ichchhā-shakṭi of Shiva, *viz.*, Saṭī, of the nature of Negation. As indicated by the etymology of the name Shiva, *viz.*, sheṭe, he who sleeps in all, the Not is

inter-present between I and This. These two make up the all and in them sleeps the Not, in the shape of (affirmative-negative) desire, and abolishes them both. This Saṭī is the disjoiner of conjoined pairs, for the transformation of the complete into incompletes is disjunction; and the Negation disjoins the I and the This. It is indeed present in them both, at their beginning middle and end, and always and everywhere separates them. That which is not limited by space, time and v a s ṭ u, substance, substantiality, thisness, is s a ṭ, being; that which possesses s a ṭ, is Saṭī. I-This is limited (in the World-process of particular experiences) by space, time and substance; s a ṭ is opposed thereto (negates the limitation); hence the s h a k ṭ i of Shiva is named Saṭī.[1]

The summation of these three, the s h a k ṭ i of Mahā-Vishṇu, is the Paramā-Shakṭi.

Each of these three is again sub-divided many times.

Lakṣhmī has three forms: Ramā, Lakṣhmī and Shāraḍā. That wherein all rejoice or play, r a m a n ṭ e, *i.e.*, expand endlessly, for play is expansion, is Ramā, connected with cognition. That whereby every object is manifested, l a k ṣ h y a ṭ e, is seen or made visible, is Lakṣhmī,

[1] The significance of these observations will be developed further in the next chapter on the *Aṭharva-Veḍa*.

connected with action. That whereby the jīva discards all, sharaḍaṭi, is Shāraḍā, connected with ichchhā.

Sarasvaṭī is sub-divided into Aindṛī, Brāhmī, and Sarasvaṭī. That which pervades, inḍaṭi, is Inḍra, and the necessity or energy of the pervasion is Aindṛī, connected with action; Brāhmī is connected with desire; and Sarasvaṭī with cognition.

The sub-divisions of Saṭī are Saṭī, Gaurī and Pārvaṭī, respectively corresponding to desire, cognition and action. The status of the guru, the giver of knowledge, is gauram, and that to whom this belongs is Gaurī. The nature of the cognition here is, 'This-(is) Not-possible' 'Not-I-anything," Not-I-This'. 'Not-This-I'; and accordingly we see in the world that on the acquisition of some partial knowledge (of the distinction between the permanent and the impermanent) dislike and weariness of the world arise in the jīva. Finally, we have Pārvaṭī, the daughter of the Parvaṭa, (literally, the mountain) which signifies the transcendence of the Negation. The power of realising or expressing this Negation in action, is Pārvaṭī; it is the power of performing such actions as end in destruction of self as well as another.[1]

[1] The text here goes off into a symbolical explanation of Himāchala, the mountain of snow, etc. It may be noted, in passing, that the explanation given in

The summation of these nine s h a k ṭ i s is the tenth, Bhairavī, of the nature of s h ū n y a, vacuum. He who protects, a v a ṭ i, the s a m s ā r a or b h a i r a, is Bhairava, and his power of protection is Bhairavī.

Such are the ten Mahā-Viḍyās. The possessor of all these is the omnipotent Īshvara. The relation between the four Īshvaras of this s a m s ā r a, *viz.*, Mahā-Vishṇu, Vishṇu, Shiva and Brahmā, and their s h a k ṭ i s, is that of s ā k ṣ h ā ṭ-k ā r a, mutual facing, vision, association.

The a v a s ṭ h ā, (?, condition, state, status, constitution, standing, standing-place) of the potency and its possessor is one (and the same ?), and this status is named the vehicle. The vehicle of Vishṇu is Garuḍa; of Brahmā, Hamsa; of Shiva, Vṛshabha.

Garuḍa signifies succession in the transcendence of time, knowledge in and of parts and particulars in succession. Hamsa is space. Vṛshabha is motion. Mahā-Vishṇu occupies one cycle within endless time; so Vishṇu too is the promulgator

---

the text of Pārvaṭī would have fitted in better with the current Purāṇic legend about Saṭī, who destroyed herself and was the cause of the destruction of her father's sacrificial arrangements; also that where the word g a u r a m is mentioned above, modern Samskṛṭ would say g a u r a v a m; and that p a r v a means a joint, a junction-point.

of (one sub-cycle of) the cycle of Mahā-Vishṇu. Only that portion of time (or sub-cycle) is Garuḍa which is or corresponds to the aspect of jñāna. The marvel of the vast movement of time is spoken of everywhere. The sweep of Garuḍa is similar in nature; in the moment of cognition it reaches into the All, the Supreme, the Transcendent; and this is true of every atom. Vishṇu causes the samsāra to be known, to become knowable, and he, in setting the time-bounds of knowledge, in the moment of his own cognition, examines and ascertains all that is ordained for his cycle and then settles down to work. The significance is that he regards all selves as his own work (kārya, effect, progeny ?), of himself and within himself, and therefore he moves to the help of his devotees when grief befalls them, leaving even his Garuḍa *i.e.*, the proper time, behind.[1]

(Such a change in the course of what has been described above as preordained necessity is

[1] This explanation refers to the Purāṇic legends according to which, in many instances, Vishṇu has left his Garuḍa behind when it could not carry him sufficiently swiftly to the side of his devotee in trouble, that is to say, in other words, when it became necessary to modify a current law in accordance with a higher or larger law. (See *Vishṇu-Bhāgavaṭa* VIII, iii, where, also, Garuḍa is described as composed of the *Veḍas*; and the *Gāruḍopanishaṭ.*)

possible for two reasons, mainly. In the first place, the event itself is not changed, but only the order, the succession in time, of events.[1] Secondly, the preordainment is perfect and literal only in the transcendental sense, *i.e.*, when we are thinking of the All, the Absolute; the pre-arrangement of the particular course of events of any particular cycle is fixed only in a general sense by the

[1] Change within changelessness is possible where the All is the Changeless, and the juxtaposition or succession of the parts is changeable. Where the balance of spirit and matter in any part—any separated portion—is such that the part becomes, self-moving as well as moved from without, moved by motives as well as by impacts, the position of that part relatively to other parts is constantly changing, apart from the action of the mechanical laws imposing changes on all parts. Hence a prophecy (based on the 'vision' of a *limited* number of facts and *planes*) which tells of a sequence in the future, a sequence which exists at the time of the prophecy and is *seen*—*fore*seen only metaphorically—may be rendered false by subsequent changes in the position of one of the parts, causing a change in the sequence the causal changes being self-motived (in consequence of facts *beyond* the limits on which the prophecy was based), and at the time of the prophecy not indicated; in fact, sometimes the prophecy (being brought out by causes deeper than its own plane) may itself act as a new cause, and avert its own fulfilment. (A.B.)

desire or will, *i.e.*, the necessity of the nature, of the ruler of that cycle, who is, in turn, subject to the desire of a higher ruler, and may therefore occasionally be over-ruled by him, and so on, endlessly.)

The vehicle of Brahmā is appropriately the Hamsa,[1] *i.e.*, space, wherein all action takes place. As the *Nyāya* says: The sub-divisions of the quarters, the directions or cardinal points, are in the Hamsa. In reality, transcendence underlies space also, and space is only a name for a certain kind of succession.[2]

---

[1] It is well-known, in current Samskṛṭ mystic literature also, that h a m-s a is only s a h-a h a m, 'That-am-I,' reversed.

[2] From one standpoint of course, space is best characterised as simultaneity, and time as succession; but both are *realised*, seen, felt, experienced, in the *succession* of the World-process, only in and by *motion*, which is explicitly successive, though implying also the being of something in and for which it takes place and which being, as a whole, exists or is simultaneously in all its constituent parts; therefore it *may* be said that, from another point of view, space is also a kind of succession, *viz.*, that very rapid kind which appears as simultaneity. The general principle under which all individualised objects divide up into inner and outer, ideal and real, abstract and concrete, applies here also. (See *The Science of Peace*, p. 283 *et seq.*)

That which moves, hides, or energises destructively, vṛṣhyaṭe, within jñāna and kriyā, is Vṛṣhabha, the Bull, the vehicle of Shiva; it is connected with the two, because they only, as being in space and time, are possible to destroy; it is the succession in the Negation.[1]

The shakṭis of the gods have the same vehicles as the gods. Aindṛī, the shakṭi of Indṛa, rides on an elephant, which signifies the conjunction of space and time, intoxicate with action, ever endeavouring to bring about a connexion between jñāna and kriyā. Vaiṣhṇavī rides on the eagle; Māheshvarī on the bull; Kaumārī on the peacock; Brāhmī on the swan; Lakṣhmī on the lotus; the white goddess, Ḍharā, on the antelope; and so on. All these vehicles differ with and symbolise the different functions of their owners.[2]

---

[1] Compare the fact of the disintegration of tissue and the formation of poisonous toxins in the organism with each exercise of function under the stress of desire, with the statements in the text about the destructive or negative property of desire and the venom in the throat of Shiva.

[2] These names are different from those of the subdivisions previously mentioned of the three principal shakṭis. Probably Aindṛī, Kaumārī, etc., are the 'wives' of the sub-hierarchs of the three principal gods. These sub-hierarchs are referred to elsewhere, without mention of names and details. Aindṛī is the consort of Indṛa; Kaumārī of Kumāra and so on.

The ornaments assigned to the divinities are similarly symbolical of functions. Thus, the lotus, the seat of Lakṣhmī, represents j ñ ā n a. For this reason, indeed, is Brahmā said to arise out of the lotus; that is to say, action arises by or from knowledge. The coming together, the facing each other, of the two, Self and This, is cognition; and in this act or process the name Brahmā is uttered (? given), for to name is also to bring face to face, as when we call another to us, (externally, or call up his picture in imagination, internally). Such names are given by j ī v a s to each other in order to indicate the specific, concrete aspect of the individual, for, otherwise, all are one in essence. At the primal conjunction of I and This, the n ā m a-k a r a ṇ a, the name-baptism, of Brahmā, Viṣhṇu, and Shiva takes place. The description of Lakṣhmī as 'lotus-handed' has the same significance; the hand is the organ of action and that holds fast to knowledge. So the other epithet of Lakṣhmī, *viz.*, Hari-priyā, beloved of Hari, signifies the power of gathering together, bringing together; for h a r a ṭ i implies taking, leading on to, bringing up, conveying.

That which upholds, ḍ h a r a ṭ i, appoints, assigns and establishes every one to and in his proper place and time and function is Ḍharā, the white or luminous, the shining goddess, the

Īshvarī, the summation of the other three s h a k ṭ i s, the supreme power of Mahā-Vishṇu, riding the Mṛga which signifies the whole mass of cycles from the v i n i h i ṭ a down to the m a h ā-m a n v a n ṭ a r a.

The reference to gems, in the descriptions of the gods and goddesses, indicates that these powers are present in all ḍ r a v y a s, substances, which are represented by gems (?)[1]

[1] The text is very obscure here; possibly the intention is that the descriptions, while symbolical, are at the same time indicative of literal facts also. The gems, jewels, and other objects that symbolise various functions, also literally help on those functions, in subtle ways, even as medical drugs affect such functions in palpable ways. That *one* consciousness runs through all things and beings; that *one*, even though *pseudo*-one, matter composes the bodies of all beings and things; that the triple subdivision with its permutations and combinations permeates, ramifies and revels through all the World-process; that all animate and so-called inanimate beings and things are interconnected; that nowhere is there a real break or division in nature, but that all is continuous one with another; that there are only differences of degree and never absolutely of kind—if these facts are always borne in mind all these old traditions will appear not unreasonable, and new and useful facts may be discovered with their help. [The theosophist divides the concrete world-system into seven groups, and

It must not be understood from all that has been said above that shaktis are really many, *i.e.*, essentially separate; they are indeed all but various forms of the one Shakti, the supreme Necessity of the Logion. The 'becoming,' the 'coming forth,' the appearing one after another, the necessary observance of a time-sequence, a successive existence, by I, This, and Not—this only is manyness; and hence appears manyness everywhere. Substance, action, motion, method, power, space, time, before, after, order, yoga, etc.,—each of these is many—and all this manyness, and with all its permutations, is enclosed in the AUM.

---

arranges within these groups, in ascending order, all elemental substances, minerals, vegetables, animals, and men. These seven spring from the three. This lies at the root of the idea of sacred plants and sacred animals, the 'sacred' plant or animal being merely the one in which the characteristics of the whole group are most powerfully summed up. All minerals similarly fall into groups, and the 'sacred' gems are those that sum up the influences incarnated in each group. By the use of the magnetism of the gem or plant or animal, a man may strengthen that magnetism in himself, and thus more readily come into touch with the ḍevas of the group, whether to gain knowledge from them or to utilise their powers. A truly scientific classification of natural objects must be made by subdivisions within these great natural divisions. (A.B.)].

The names of this multi-une Shakṭi are many.[1]

---

[1] A long list of names follows here, each significant of one special aspect or function—but they are not explained in the text.

SECTION III. (*Continued*).

CHAPTER VII (*Continued*). Sub-Section (iii).

THE SĀMA-VEḌA.

The need to meditate on Necessity.—The contents of the *Sāma-Veḍa*.—Considerations as to variations in the order of succession of cognition, etc.—The significance of devotion and of hymns and singing, generally.

The acquirement of the knowledge of this Necessity is alone ḍ h y ā n a, thinking, meditation; the ḍ h y e y a, the object of thought or meditation, is the Necessity. There is no thinking without necessity. Only that object is thought about regarding which a desire arises, and only at that time; no other object and at no other time. Or, if, with great exertion, the thought is driven into another direction, it is but sin, p ā p a. For sin is nothing else than the neglecting of the real necessity of the Self (*i.e.*, the higher Self) and engaging it in something else. Otherwise, there is no p ā p a and no p u ṇ y a, no sin and no merit. Hence indeed the counsel: He who neglects the certain and goes after the uncertain, loses both. The certain here means the necessary. Also: Let the wise man welcome insult and put pride behind him,

and accomplish his duty. In doing that which is necessary, *i.e.*, is required by duty, there is neither honor nor dishonor. These two are connected with the unnecessary. Praise is given for the doing of what is not obligatory, what is more than necessary; it is pronounced in the u ḍ ā ṭ ṭ a-s v a r a, the 'loud' tone: 'he has done what it was not his obligatory duty to do, what was difficult to do.' Blame is also similarly given, but in the a n u ḍ ā ṭ ṭ a-s v a r a, the 'low' tone: 'He has done what was improper, against his duty to do.' One's duty, one's proper work, is accompanied by the s v a r i ṭ a-s v a r a, the 'even' tone, wherein there is neither praise nor blame [1]. Dawn, sunset and noon, and night and day recur most regularly, of necessity; none thinks of praise or blame for them, though all rejoice therein. And the lesson from this is that all actions should be done in the same way. Nīṭi, ethics, is the science which teaches what is necessary to do. [2] There is a need, a neces-

[1] This whole page is an illustration in an especial degree of what the whole work impresses continually upon the mind of the reader, *viz.*, the importance, the dignity, the profundity, the connexion with essentials, of the so-called familiar and commonplace.

[2] For a full exposition of this idea, *viz.*, that the right act is the act which, at that time and place, at that stage in evolution, best forwards the evolution of the world, and thus accords with the will of

sity for this action at this time, this conduct brings about this result, the way of the accomplishment of such a thing is this, this is the proper act in this reference, this the allotted time, the space or place, etc.,—is all taught by *Nīṭi*.

Hence the need to meditate on Necessity: 'Thou art the san-ḍhyā, the sāviṭrī, the mother of all'. Sanḍhyā is the object, the proper time, and also the process of true prayer and meditation, samyak-ḍhyāna. The many hymns addressed to Shakṭi, all indicate Her importance. These prayers and salutations imply the wish for possession of Her in Her aspect of power to fulfil our wants, and signify the supreme and compelling power of Necessity. Indeed all mutual human and other salutation and reply, and prayers and other conventions, also, all refer to the satisfaction of each other's 'needs,' the helping of each other in and with their wants. Vanḍana and abhi-vāḍana, obeisance and salutation, mean but this: 'I am younger than thou; behold my need and fulfil it'; and praṭy-abhi-vāḍa, the reply, similarly means the gracious acceptance of the office of helper: 'I see thy need and shall endeavour to satisfy it; I am thine and thou art mine, etc.'

Īshvara in helping the world to reach its appointed goal—see *The Advanced Text-Book of Sanāṭana Ḍharma*, Part. III.

The *Sāma-veḍa*, from its beginning, 'O Fire! come to purify us,' up to the very end, is dedicated to a description of the nature of this Shakṭi. All such matters as these: What is the necessity underlying the divisions of the world, its distinctions, differences, separatenesses? What is this separateness and how does it arise? What is the proof, origin and significance of numbers, 1, 2, 3, etc., and what is the necessity of their existence and increase and infinite multiplication? What is the nature and necessity of numberlessness and of its operation? What is the power of retention, whereby learning, bodied knowledge, is always present to the mind? What is the necessity of Power or Energy; of energy within energy; the energy of succession; the power of time; the necessity of divisions of time; of divisions of action; of summation; of cognition, reflexion, contemplation, deliberation, 'revolving in mind,' the work of buḍḍhi, reason or intelligence, generally; the power of the organs to perceive; the necessity of grāhakas, receivers (sense-organs), prāpakas, transmitters (media, ether, air, light, saliva) prāpyas, objects? What is the necessity of actor, causation, mode, real and unreal or true and false conduct; of omnipotence, transcendent power, of the power that is the cause of the origin of the elements, and of their quintuplication? What is the

necessity of mutual relationship; of the power or energy of the atom; of ideation; of substance, attribute and movement; of the distinction between principal and secondary, generality and singularity, division and unity, worker and instrument, words, meanings, things and thoughts? The use of decision, final conclusion, determination; the power of doubt and certainty; the necessity and the succession thereof; the cause of their appearance; the use of marks and definitions? The endlessness and beginninglessness, as well as the beginnings and ends, of 'becomings' and 'destructions'? Birth and death and simultaneousness? The ability to do work; attainment and failure; the use and significance of ḍharma, arṭha, kāma and of their summation in mokṣha; each cause whereby each thing 'becomes,' with its necessity and its law; each pleasure and pain, each joy and sorrow; pralaya, the dissolution of the world; and sannyāsa, renunciation, and all the activity of ichchhā; and the co-ordination and synthesis of all things whatsoever, worlds within atoms, and atoms within those worlds again, endlessly—all this is dealt with in the *Sāma-Veḍa*.

It may be asked why the *Sāma-Veḍa* was not placed after the *Ṛk*, when the usual order is: first, cognition; then saṅkalpa, *i.e.*, resolution,

or ichchhā, *i.e.*, desire; and then yaṭna, conation or kriyā, *i.e.*, action. The reply is that because of the universality of the principles enunciated in the *Sāma*, it is, truly speaking, needed before, during, as well as after kriyā. Ichchhā pervades everything, *i.e.*, the other two factors. But for this very reason is it counted third (after the two factors which it pervades). So, in the AUM itself, M or Negation, which pervades and connects the other two, is placed third. From the end it can reach out everywhere. Hence the *Brahma-sūṭra*: 'The beginning and the end are not separate.'[1] From another standpoint, it may be said indeed that the order does not matter. The first becomes the last and the last first; hence the absence of difference. A beginning may be made with the end; in place of AUM we may read MUA. But for practical purposes the I must be posited first, then the This, and then the two should be reduced to or connected by the Not. In every *Veḍa*, the order is jñāna, ichchhā, kriyā (?)[2]. In the *Aṭharva* the order is the same, at

[1] Compare the English saying, 'Extremes meet'.

[2] The text seems to require some elucidation here. The successive parts of each *Veḍa i.e.*, *Manṭra*, *Brāhmaṇa*, *Upaniṣhaṭ* and *Ṭanṭra*, correspond to cognition, action, desire, and summation, rather than cognition, desire, action and summation. Possibly there-

first; then, again, i c h c h h ā, then j ñ ā n a, then k r i y ā; or again, j ñ ā n a in or after k r i y ā; and this is so, because in the summation the order becomes manifold by permutation. Knowledge is possible in, by, or after action, as may be seen in the fact that by imitation of another's action one may also obtain his results in knowledge and become like him.

In this way there is always order in the World-process as well as violation thereof, *i.e.*, law and exception and higher law and so on, endlessly, the following out of the one in the many being

---

fore what is meant here is only that the order of cognition, desire and action, is referred to in every *Veḍa* as the usual order of rotation of these three factors or aspects of consciousness. This is so because the connecting link, desire, should come between the two factors connected, I and Not-I, corresponding to cognition and action. 'I know it, I like it, I seek it'—is the normal way of life. At the same time, in order to illustrate the fact that no possibility can be excluded from the World-process, we have these also: 'I wish to know; I try to learn, I am doing all I can to find out; I know how to act, I know how to choose, etc.' But again, however, on analysis, these so to say abnormal forms are also always reducible to the normal. Their mere existence, though, is sufficient justification for the text. (See foot-note at pp. 31-35 *supra*). Also while the relation *exists between* the things related, it is *observed* or *described after* they have been.

order or law, and the appearance of the many in the one disorder and exception.[1]

Bhakṭi, devotion, resides in the *Sāma-Veḍa* as a means to moksha. There is no inconsistency between this statement and the other, that moksha results from true knowledge. From the standpoint of bhakṭi,[2] moksha or liber-*ation* is an action, and action requires desire as motive and knowledge as guide. Mokṣha, thus, can be secured only by means of appropriate action under the stress of appropriate desire (arising out of appropriate knowledge). Hence the statement that it is obtained by chanting the *Sāma*.

As the *Ṛk* expounds the methods of studying and teaching, and the *Yajuh* those of performing yajña-sacrifice, so the method of chanting

---

[1] In the language of evolutionists, the 'rule' becomes the principle of natural selection, and the 'breach of rule' corresponds to the principle of spontaneous variation. The pre-existence, in possibility, of such endless variations is the element of truth in the one view, *viz.*, that of the eternal fixity of species. The unfolding of the possibility along graduated lines is the truth in the supplemental view, *viz.*, that of evolution.

[2] Bhakṭi and bhajana, seem to come from the same root as devotion, voting, vowing, *vovere*, *votum*, 'reproducing in oneself the characteristics of the object of devotion, the ideal'. (See *Rāma-Tāpāni-Upaniṣhaṭ*.)

hymns is taught in the *Sāma*; and such singing or chanting arises only out of bhakṭi. A hymn is a description of the deeds, the life-work, of the ideal, and deeds are dependent on the desire, the power, of that ideal. It may be said that a hymn assumes a separateness between devotee and lord; but the conventional relations of greater and smaller do arise in the world by and of necessity, and in these circumstances a hymn is appropriate, (especially, as, though it begins with an assumption of separateness, it aims at union, equalisation). Every hymn signifies: Thou art so great and performest such wonders; teach me how I too may do them, and attain to thy estate. The rule of continuous instruction prevails everywhere in the World-process, 'I teach thee, thou another, that other a third,' etc.; and a hymn is intended only to elicit such instruction; it does not create any new and real separateness in the Great Unity. Thus, then, hymns are also means to the true knowledge, for so long as one's desires, one's needs, are not expressed to another they cannot be fulfilled and satisfied by that other. Such fulfilment indeed is a conjunction, a union; and giving information to another is also a conjunction with him, a union in consciousness. Strictly, indeed, a desire is a desire only so long as it remains uncommunicated to another. (As soon as it is mentioned to another it may be said to

have become partly fulfilled, to have passed into the stage of action, to have lost its character of pure desire). When the desire embodies a very great and urgent need or necessity, then steps are taken at the very earliest opportunity to communicate it to another, and seek from him the satisfaction thereof. Such is the principle of the relation between the teacher and the pupil. The latter says to the former: Thou knowest more than I do; I want this knowledge; teach it to me. And the former complies.

Endless sub-divisions of kinds of hymns are made by differences of time, space, and motion. In some, only the greatness of the ideal is dwelt upon; in others, only the littleness of the singer; in a third kind, both, and so on.

Thus is the ultimate purpose of the hymn also to lead up to the final knowledge of the Brahman-state, the realisation of the Supreme Shakṭi of whom the gods have sung:

O Ḍevī! Thou that in Thyself unitest
The might of each and all the gathered Gods!
That from the fount of Self this universe
Outpourest! Ambikā! our little Mother!
We bow to Thee in reverence and love.
O Thou! whose might, matchless and measureless,
Ananṭa, Brahmā, or e'en Hara's self,
May not in speech encompass, Chandikā!
Do thou protect us from all evil fears.

Thou art the affluence of the virtuous home,
Thou the dire want that blasts th' abode of sin,
Thou art the good man's simple-hearted faith,
Thou art the modesty of those well-born,
Thou art th' intelligence beneath whose gaze
The heart of every science lies unbared.
Thou art the Sacred Script where lie enshrined
The stainless words of Ṛk, the holy hymns
Of Yajuṣh and the music of the Sāma,
Thou art the Viḍyā whom the sinless ones,
The sages who have seen the truth of sense
And sense's object, serve unceasingly,
Thou art the wisdom in the hearts of those
That have achieved the vision of the Self—
We bow to Thee, again, guard Thou the
worlds.[1]

---

[1] These verses are to be found in the extant *Ḍurgā-sapṭa-shaṭī.*

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER VIII.

THE AṬHARVA-VEḌA.

The *Aṭharva* as the summation of the other three *Veḍas.*—The partless unity of the Whole appearing as uniformity amidst endless variation and detail of parts.—The realisation of non-separateness the one final goal.—The contents of the *Aṭharva.*—Endless successions.—The significance of s a ṭ and a s a ṭ.—Why s a ṭ corresponds with k r i y ā, ā n a n ḍ a with i c h c h h ā, and c h i ṭ with cognition.—The explanation of the symbology connected with S h i v a.—S a ṭ-c h i ṭ-ā n a n ḍ a and the nerve currents of i ḍ ā-p i ṅ g a l ā-sushumnā.—Reproduction of trinity in each.—Endless permutations.—Further contents of the *Aṭharva.*

The fourth *Veḍa* is the *Aṭharva,* and its place as the fourth notifies us of its character; it is the summation of the preceding three. In the summation we find at once the seeds which expand into the three, and the expression of their fundamental unity. In the *Aṭharva* the World-process is seen as a whole, as a method, rather than as expressed in its separate characteristics. Its *Mahā-vākya* is therefore that which sums up in a single phrase the whole World-

process—I-this-Not. It expounds the Self, the Not-Self, and the nexus between them, the Negation which implies a previous affirmation; it contains the workings of all activity, the marks of all knowledge, the repletion of all desire, the whole of life, the whole of Brahma-viḍyā, the inmost science of the Whole. To know the *Aṭharva* is to know the essence of the World-process, and the essence of the activity of the atom, the junctions, disjunctions, interjunctions and conjunctions which make up that World-process. The *Ṛk*, telling of cognition, the *Yajuh*, of action, the *Sāma*, of desire, are but parts of this, which sums them up in one great generalisation. As the *Ṛk* is reflected in all *Manṭras*, the *Yajuh* in all *Brāhmaṇas*, the *Sāma* in all *Upanishaṭs*, so is the *Aṭharva* reflected in the *Ṭanṭra*, the great science, by which worlds are built.

While, in the Whole, everything is compacted in one partless consciousness and everything is equal and simultaneous, in the sequence of the parts of the World-process is seen the succession of cognition, desire and action, all again reaching unity in the summation. As say some ancient shlokas:

All living things have knowledge, though their avenues of knowledge vary; some are blind by day and some by night, and some can see alike in both; all animals, all birds and

beasts, have knowledge, and the knowledge of men is similar to theirs; so is their knowledge also similar to that of men; and similar also are human ways to theirs.[1]

Such statements indicate the essential unity, the equality, the in-difference, in nature, of all knowledge and all activity. The one goal of all beings is knowledge—of the One and All. Yet this is realised in ever different places and ever different cycles, for in these differences consists the nature of the World-process, and blindness and vision, day and night, have larger meanings in larger cycles, for large and small repeat each other.[2] Some jīvas 'see by night' being blind in the day of manifestation, and learning to see by passing through the night of pralaya. Others are 'blind by night' not gaining knowledge even after passing through pralaya; for such pass fruitless many creations and many dissolutions, and numerous are such jīvas. Yet is the quest the same, and the goal is reached by all.[3]

---

[1] These verses occur in the current *Ḍurgā-sapṭa-shaṭī.*

[2] "As above so below," "As the small so the large," "History repeats itself," "There is nothing new under the sun," etc.

[3] This important statement has a direct bearing on the burning question as to whether jīvas make progress when excarnate. The text seems to imply

That separateness is pain and unity peace, that all is AUM, this is the essence of all sacred teaching; this, this alone, is Truth. To be liberated is to conquer separateness, for Samsāra arises from cognition, desire and action separated,[1] in endless permutations and combinations; this is the knowledge of all knowledges.

The *Aṭharva Veḍa,* as the summation, instructs us in the principles which equally underlie the methods of the World-process and of the atom-process—a world in miniature. Whether 'World-process' or 'atom-process'—depends on the speaker and his point of view. As every manṭra of this *Veḍa* reflects the operations of the World-process, so does it reveal to us cognition within cognition, memory within memory, power within power, world within world, fact within fact, action within action, duty within duty, sin within sin, individuality within individuality, ascending and descending from every point in space, endlessly, ceaselessly. (Atoms make up molecules, molecules compounds, compounds cells, cells

---

what has been elsewhere taught that "we must work while it is day, the night cometh when no man can work". (John, ix. 4) (E. H. B.)

[1] When equality is restored between wish and thought and deed, when wish is no longer father to thought, but the two are mere aspects of a unity, peace is reached. (E. H. B.) गुणानाम् समता लयः ।

tissues, tissues organs, organs bodies, bodies communities; communities classes and races; classes and races kingdoms; kingdoms of many grades and varied linkings make up a planet, planets make up a solar system, solar systems a vaster system, and so on, unending; nowhere is found simplicity indivisible; nowhere complexity final. All is relative.)[1]

The World-process is not one succession but many, everywhere beginnings, everywhere endings, each beginning the ending of an old order, each ending the beginning of a new one. The successions in the Logion give the successions in the World-process. I-Not-This is cognition-desire-action; Not-This-I is desire-action-cognition; I-this-Not is cognition-action-desire. The activities of Brahmā, Shiva, Vishṇu, have herein their record, with the summation in Mahā-Vishṇu, wherein their separation vanishes. S a ṭ, c h i ṭ and ā n a n ḍ a, inseparate and yet in succession, are in their unity B r a h m a n,

[1] Western science is endorsing this ancient teaching in the most complete fashion. The atom is now spoken of as a complex body, resembling a solar system; the 'little' as revealed by the microscope is as infinite as the 'great' revealed by the telescope; the limit of knowledge in both cases is the strength of the lens not the bankruptcy of nature. Science would justify us in seeing in the atom a solar system, and in this planets, and in the planets communities and so on, down to the minuter atom again. (A. B.)

and yet, since inseparate, any one of them may be said to be Brahman, as in various *Veḍa*-texts. In succession, saṭ is kriyā, and Brahmā, the creator; chiṭ is jñāna, and Vishṇu, the preserver; ānanḍa is ichchhā, and Shiva, the dissolver into peace. In saṭ, asaṭ is included, for although it be true that only that is defined to be saṭ, which is not limited by time, nor space, nor substance, such a definition cannot arise without the recognition of time and space and substance by the definer, and hence without the recognition of asaṭ. The unlimited is that which cannot be defined or measured by, or in, time, space and substance; it is that the beginning or ending of which is inconceivable. Yet can it only be recognised in innumerable be-ings, within numberless beginnings and endings, which in endless multiplicity strive to mirror unity. We cannot point to a 'this' and say, 'This, in this place, is saṭ, being.' (Neither can we say, 'This is asaṭ,' for saṭ is there, making possible the manifestation.) Because we cannot say 'This is saṭ,' wholly (nor 'This is asaṭ,' wholly) therefore is the Samsāra, the World-process, called miṭhyā, mythical, false; that which is neither existent nor non-existent, but both, is false, and hence the World-process itself is false, illusive. The *Nyāya* declares: The very nature of the world is existence and non-existence, the World-

process consisting in this verily. So also the *Brahma-Sūṭra* speaks of 'the s a ḍ a s a ṭ, the many, or the false,' these terms being synonymous. A s a ṭ means 'not-being,' 'no-thing,' and signifies space and time, the two illusions and creators of illusions. To be connected with space and time is to be a s a ṭ, non-existent, unreal; yet inasmuch as a s a ṭ *appears*, therefore it always includes an element of s a ṭ also. For the World-process being s a ḍ a s a ṭ, and being made up of space, time and substance, and space and time being a s a ṭ, the third element in the World-process, v a s ṭ u, substance, must be (that which corresponds to) s a ṭ. These three make up the 'procession'. Hence s a ṭ is connected with action, active or actual process being impossible without substance, without which space and time were mere emptinesses.[1]

1 The following triplets are frequently met with: time-space-motion, time-space-causality, time-space-substance. Eliminating the two common factors, it would appear that motion, causality and substance correspond with each other. And in a sense they do so; causation is the work of force or energy which is desire; and substantiality is, in one aspect, the power of self-maintenance and other-resistance (which characterises S a ṭ ṭ ā, see p. 12 *supra*), and it manifests by vibration or motion etc. But this would make substance correspond with desire. Here however the aspect of motion or action is emphasised. Again, elsewhere, time is said to correspond with desire, K ā l a,

Saṭ thus corresponds with kriyā, presided over by Brahmā. Chiṭ, or chaiṭanya, similarly corresponds with jñāna, presided over by Viṣhṇu, and ānanḍa belongs to Shiva, the lord of ichchhā, full of all bliss, self-willed, turned inwards away from all outer things, and the cause of the dissolution of all things into the Self. Hence does the hymn sing of Shiva:

I bow to him, who sleeps within all beings:
I bow to him, who re-absorbeth all;
Three-eyed, five-faced, bedecked with linked skulls,
Wreathed round with serpents, lord of Pārvaṭī.
I bow to him, the source of all the worlds.

Ichchhā, desire, is hid in all things, hence is Shiva said to sleep in all beings. He re-absorbs all, as well as is the source of all, because of his nature, the Negation—the Negation which first affirms and then denies, ichchhā first coveting with greed and then rejecting with satiety. He is called the Three-eyed because he protects and carries out the triple Negation, triple because covering cognition, desire and action, and again because the Negation is not only itself, but is ever inseparably connected during the World-process with the Aham and the Eṭaṭ. For this reason also is Shivā, the feminine

Shiva etc. We can reconcile these apparent differences as the result of differences of point of view.

aspect of Shiva, said to be ṭri-guṇā, possessed of three attributes. There is no World-process possible without this trinity; if there were no Aham and no Eṭaṭ the Negation could not apply to anything, and in their mutual annihilation the Negation vanishes.

Aham is the right eye of Shiva; Eṭaṭ the left; the third eye above both is Na. By this third, Aham and Eṭaṭ are destroyed, and hence comes the tradition that the third eye of Shiva is and causes pralaya. In the Logion also the Na is placed after the Aham and the Eṭaṭ, and in the written symbol of the *Prāṇava* ॐ, it is the dot placed above the A and U.

The 'five-faced' Shiva has a similar interpretation. In the creative thought, 'I am This—I am Brahman taking form,' the Aham is one aspect; the desire to create is the second; the shining forth is the third; the performance of actions is the fourth; the result of the actions is the fifth. So in the destructive thought, 'I am not This,' *i.e.*, 'I will destroy this,' the faces are: the Aham; the consideration of the nexus between the Aham and the Eṭaṭ; the desire to disunite the two; the breaking of the link and the consequent disappearance of the Eṭaṭ; and, lastly, the disappearance also of the Aham. Yet again may the faces be translated as jñāna, ichchhā, kriyā, and samāhāra, and their destruction.

The string of skulls, emblem of those changes which are summed up in death, signifies the pralaya-nature.

The wreath of serpents indicates the regulation of time-cycles. Everywhere the World-process proceeds by time-cycles, and the time of pralaya, the Negation, is called vyāla, a serpent.

Again Mundā is the aspect of Māyā which destroys all things, and hence the name of Shiva as "the lord of Chāmundā."

Hence, finally, by the destruction of all limitations and distinctions, the destruction of all separate things, is Shiva identified with ānanḍa, bliss, which is the absence of all separateness.

Time is triple, following the M, the A and the U. The first, of the nature of M, is the bringer of pralaya, and is called vyāla. These vyālas are represented by the sacred thread, the wrist-chaplets, the ear-rings, and the other ornaments of Shiva, and these ornaments, again, indicate the actions or functions(?).[1] The wrath, the disintegrating energy, necessary for the work of destruction, for the bringing about of pralaya, is the hālāhala, the deadly poison. When the ocean of Brahman is churned, of the gems that come forth, Viṣhṇu takes those

[1] In allegory, serpents usually signify spiral currents of energies, vital forces, and also time-cycles.

that are of the nature of Aham; those of the nature of Eṭaṭ are claimed by Brahmā; that of the nature of Na, the hālāhala, is finally taken by Shiva, who by drinking it, declares his readiness for the bringing about of pralaya.

Many expressions scattered in the descriptions of Shiva are to be explained in similar fashion; the epithet Chanḍra-shekhara, the moon-crested, means he who delights, chanḍaṭe, or illuminates all. And so explanations may be given of other symbols, such as: the aghora-manṭras, each issuing from one of the five mouths; the bhasma or purifying ashes; the destruction of Kāma, Cupid; the effacement of the scroll of Destiny; the vibhūṭi or sovereign powers, also ashes; the peak of Kailāsa; the mṛga-charma, or deer-skin; the māṭaṅga-charma, or elephant-skin; the retinue of daimons; the ṭrishūla, or trident; the epithet Nata-rāja-rāja, the king of dancers; the double-headed drum, etc. In connexion with Viṣhṇu, the four arms, the conch, the discus, etc., have been already explained. The lotus-seat of Brahmā is also significant; he is the basis, Ḍhāṭā, and has also the names of Viḍyā, Mahaṭ, Buḍḍhi, etc.[1]

Saṭ-chiṭ-ānanḍa is the summation into one of action, cognition and desire. The reason of this order is as follows. Kriyā, action, is all

[1] Here regarded as the *active* sub-aspect of intelligence.

pratyaksha, sense-cognisable; pratyaksha, sense-cognition, comes first. Vichāra, thought-inference, is based on and follows after that; on beholding action, the thought arises that there must be some one who is the manifestor, the regulator, of this activity; this thought is boḍha, awareness, which is chiṭ. Finally comes the question; what is the connexion between these two, by what force do these two, saṭ and chiṭ, hold together? As answer, there becomes manifest ichchhā, of the nature of ānanḍa. But in truth there is no invariable order, since in the One all is simultaneous, and in succession any may be first or second or third. Only the conjoint triune AUM is universal, and the permutations of its factors, A, U, and M, vary in different universes, albeit for our universe the order is that of the Logion, Aham—Eṭaṭ—Na. Hence even here, at certain times or places, the beginning may be action, or cognition, or desire, for at each point is a beginning and an ending, an effect and a cause, and each is either, according to the relations under review. The Saṭ-chiṭ-ānanḍa, the triune, is present in every atom, and according to the function required one or other manifests predominantly, while all is Brahman. This tri-unity of Saṭ-chiṭ-ānanḍa is the all-auspicious Ṭrikuṭī, the true Ṭriveṇī. For Gaṅgā, who bringeth mukṭi, is the Shakṭi,

the Necessity, flowing forth from the Tri-unity; while the separate shakṭis are Gaṅgā, Yamunā and Sarasvaṭī, corresponding[1] to saṭ, chiṭ, ānanḍa, and also to the three nāḍ̤īs—(spinal nerves and vital currents in the body) iḍ̤ā, piṅgalā and sușhumnā. Each of the several manifestations, Vișhṇu, Shiva and Brahmā, is at times indifferently called saṭ, chiṭ, or ānanḍa, because all three are present in each atom.

On this same principle, kriyā, action, motion, involves the idea of space, in which actions begin and end; and space thus involves time; and time involves both motion and space. Thus all involves all. That one attribute is assigned to one, and another to another—as, saṭ is Brahmā, chiṭ Vișhṇu, ānanḍa Shiva—is due simply to the predominance of one attribute at a special time and in a special space and a special individual.

It is important to note that the trinity reappears in each of its members. Thus in saṭ, the *a* is the immortal (the creator), the *s* the mortal (the destroyer), while the *ṭ* (Vișhṇu) protects. In chiṭ, the *i* is the Aham-shakṭi, the power of the Self, (Vișhṇu); the *ch* is that which moves, *i.e.*, the samsāra, the world, (and Brahmā); and the *ṭ* is that which con-

[1] Whether respectively, in the order given, or otherwise, the text does not make clear.

sumes[1] (Shiva). In ā n a n ḍ a m, the *a* is the A ṭ m ā, together with the A n ā ṭ m ā, (Brahmā); the *nan* is the cognition or the conjunction of A n ā ṭ m ā and Ā ṭ m ā (Viṣhṇu); the *ḍam* is that which bestows all, necessity, desire, (Shiva).

The knowledge of the permutations and combinations of these is the end and aim of all s h ā s ṭ r a s, of all teachings, and the practice thereof, the actual formation of spaces, times and movements corresponding therewith, is the practice of the true Sanāṭana Vaiḍika Ḍharma, the Ancient Religion of Knowledge, is the performance of all y a j ñ a s, is the attainment of the nature of B r a h m a n.

The *Aṭharva Veḍa* expounds these permutations and their summation as s a ṭ-c h i ḍ-ā n a n-ḍ a. Thus there may be: ā n a n ḍ a, c h i ṭ, s a ṭ; s a ṭ, ā n a n ḍ a, c h i ṭ; s a ṭ, c h i ṭ, ā n a n ḍ a; ā n a n ḍ a, s a ṭ, c h i ṭ; and so on. B r a h m a n is not s a ṭ alone, nor c h i ṭ alone, nor ā n a n ḍ a alone. It is all three at once, as conjoined in the AUM.

So also are the other three *Veḍas* summed up in the *Aṭharva*, and when this has been mastered, they are seen to be subject to similar

[1] Change of situation may explain change of function; like the change of appearance of an object with change of standpoint of observer, so often referred to. An army is a 'destroyer' to the enemy, a 'preserver' to its own nation.

permutations of order. The permutations of their logia are likewise shown in the *Aṭharva.* The expansion and coming forth of all the processes of the world, the origination of one from another, the combination of diversity and unity and the results thereof, the interdependence of all things, the co-ordination of all things into unity, the causes which lead to the distinction between things to be avoided and to be accepted, and the tracing of all kinds of kriyās through all these operations and processes in the world—all this is expounded in the *Aṭharva Veḍa.* What enterprise remains to be undertaken after the acquirement of the knowledge of the Self, the Not-self, and Desire—this also is explained in the *Aṭharva,* as are also the many manifestations and functions of Brahmā, Shiva and Viṣhṇu, their endless operations, the experiencing of cognition, desire and action, the functioning of Shakṭi, etc.; in short, the details of the expanding and evolution of the universe. Here, too, we learn of the gradual transformation of atoms into ākāsha, of ākāsha into vāyu, of vāyu into agni, of agni into āpas, and finally of āpas into pṛṭhivi, and also of the reverse process at pralaya. Here, also, of the connexion between the hierarchies and their powers and corresponding works, times, spaces and numbers.

Such is the *Aṭharva-Viḍyā* yet, in the study of details, must never be forgotten that the Āṭmā is ever untrammelled by and ever free from all such limitations.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER IX.

The Brāhmaṇas.

The reasons for the name *Brāhmaṇa*, common to a portion of the scriptures and to a caste.—The general nature and scheme of the contents and the authorship of the *Brāhmaṇas*.—The mystery of being, the endlessness of details, and their synthesis and unification in the scriptures.—The relation of the various parts of the scriptures, as principle and concrete detail, aphorism and commentary.—The *Brāhmaṇas* of the *Ṛg-Veḍa*.—Those of the *Yajuh*.—Those of the *Sāma*.—Those of the *Aṭharva*.—Opening root-sentences of each of the four.—Recapitulation.—The significance of hymns and prayers.—The allegory of Mahā-Vishṇu sleeping in the ocean of milk.

The *Mahā-vākya* is the seed-thought; the *Veḍas* are the expansion and development of that seed; and the *Brāhmaṇas* are the further xpansion of the *Veḍas*, that is to say, of the *Samhiṭā* proper. There are four *Brāhmaṇas* to each *Veḍa*, corresponding severally with cognition, desire, action and the summation.

It is true that the word *Brāhmaṇa* is applied to a caste. It is applied to this part of scripture

also for the same etymological reasons. He who knows Brahman is a brāhmaṇa; that which imparts the knowledge of Brahman, reveals it and makes it known, is also *Brāhmaṇa*.

Further details of the four factors of the World-process, cognition, etc., are expounded in these *Brāhmaṇas*. The four sub-hierarchs of Vishṇu write the jñāna-portions; the four sub-hierarchs of Brahmā, the kriyā-portions; and those of Shiva the ichchhā-portions. The summation-portions are also similarly dealt with by four sub-hierarchs, niyāmakas. These divisions within divisions arise in consequence of the endless variations, modifications and correlations which each factor undergoes; and separate office-bearers have to be deputed to deal with each main type of work arising out of these variations. It is admitted on all hands that a whole world-system exists in each atom, that in every world-system again are innumerable atoms, and that every atom performs such an incalculable number of movements that those of even a single day cannot be accurately counted by the whole science of *Jyotiṣha*. The result is that only the general principles of the co-ordination of all the multifarious things of the World-process can be mastered, even with the help of these many *Brāhmaṇas*; and this is the whole fruit of knowledge.

Therefore is it that to know the Unity is to become Brahman. Otherwise indeed the world is endless and beyond the knowledge of any. As is written:

The knower knoweth not; who doth not know
He only knoweth, knoweth he the all.
Ask not of others, look within Thyself.

Such is the mystery of Being, such the wonder of the world. Thou thyself art all. Dost thou not recognise thyself within thyself? Art thou, or art thou not? Dost thou know or dost thou not know? Dost thou act or dost thou not act? If thou knowest not thine own work, is it not wonderful that thou shouldst seek to know the world? That which to thee seems marvellous is only that which does not enter into thy intelligence, either because of the narrowness of that intelligence, or from inattention, or lack of relevant and careful consideration. In truth, there is naught marvellous; for everywhere, everything exists.

Hence the teaching, to be heedfully grasped and followed: attend first to thy duty to wife and children; then, to thy duty to thy country, the larger home; and then, to thy duty to the whole earth; then, to thy duty to the world-system, the brahmāṇda. Thus, stage by stage, will the unity of the whole be realised. And as there are many stages in the life-work of a man, so may it be inferred that

there are likewise many in the life-work of Mahā-Vishṇu. What is in the root, that only appears in the branch. The highest truth, the law according to which the worlds are created, that same law manifests in every atom. To that law, smallness and greatness are both alike, or may even be said not to exist, for that which is manifest in the small, that only is manifest in the great, and *vice versa.* The knowledge of the truth is not necessarily attained by the study of only the so-called large or great. It is attained equally by the full and free study of a single atom.

And, indeed, thus only can all sciences, all teachings, be saved from futility. There is no knowledge worthy of the name until all sciences, all teachings, can be deduced from and applied to a single atom. In the absence of such insight and comprehensive grasp, to say 'I have learnt this,' 'I have learnt that,' is mere vanity. This co-ordination, synthesis, unification, equality or sameness of all should be realised by the study of the atom, and then—for the elimination of all suspicion of separateness and the establishment of a complete co-ordination in detail—all the sciences, all the shāsṭras, should be studied.

Thus, then, in their respective lines of succession and official gradation, in the department of work of each, Mahā-Vishṇu, Vishṇu, Brahmā and Shiva, and of Shakṭi, the consort or

energy, of each also, there are four chief subordinates and four main laws of cognition etc., worked by them. This quaternary (of office-bearers or sub-hierarchs, or laws of nature, or modes of life and consciousness) manifests throughout the world. And under each of these again are other four, and under them still others and so on endlessly.[1] This endlessness is

[1] A familiar illustration may bring these statements home to the reader and justify at the same time the law of analogy, 'as above so below,' 'as the small so the great'. Roughly, the life of a nation may be divided into (*a*) educational, (*b*) industrial, (*c*) administrative, which binds the other two together, and (*d*) 'policy,' 'government,' 'national life' as a whole in an all-comprehensive sense, corresponding respectively to cognition, action, desire and summation. 'The welfare of the nation' is the root-principle, the watchword, the motto, the 'logion,' which sums up its whole life. The expansion of this logion is the statute-book which governs in more detail the departments above-mentioned. But under each of these we may discern others. Under (*a*) educational, we may note the further division of (i) Tutorial and professorial function, literary and scientific research, or educational work proper, (ii) ecclesiastical, theological, religious, philosophical and literary activity and ministration, (iii) inspectorial, supervisory or disciplinary work which connects the other two and makes their working possible, and (iv) 'Pedagogics,' dealing with educational

the endlessness of the ways of individual manifestation, whereas Unity constantly resides unbroken in the Necessity of the Three-in-One. For necessity is ever one, unique, partless, non-comparative, ungraded and ungradable. If a thing is necessary, no question arises of its being

---

policy, the bearing on the national life of the growth of knowledge of this and the other world—again corresponding to cognition, action, desire and summation. Under (*b*) industrial, we have (i) scientific knowledge and art, (ii) factories, trades, industries, commerce and all appliances for travel, (iii) the organisation of labor and capital which makes the utilisation of (i) for (ii) possible, and (iv) economics as a whole. Under (c) we have (i) the financial, (ii) the civil, and (iii) the military, or force proper, which makes the two others possible, and (iv) office and legislation generally. Under (d) we may distinguish (i) the science and scheme of government, politics in the widest sense, (ii) the functions of the ruler, whether monarchical, parliamentary or republican, (iii) the sovereign will, and finally (iv) the national organisation as a whole.

Each of these sub-divisions again has its own (1) bye-laws, rules etc., (2) the applications or workings out of those rules and bye-laws, (3) disciplinary or police provisions which make the other two possible, and(4) the scheme rationalising the whole. The illustration may be worked out to an indefinite length. Thus (*c*.iii) military, may be sub-divided into (1) the science and art of offensive and defensive con-

small or great; it is simply indispensable. When we say of a thing that it is more necessary and of another that it is less necessary, what we mean really is that in the particular circumstances only the one is truly and indispensably necessary, and that the other can be dispensed

---

structions, forts, men-of-war, weapons, the theories of tactics, strategy, manœuvres, drill and discipline etc., (2) actual defence and offence operations, (3) the commissariat and (4) general domestic and foreign military policy. And any one of these, say the commissariat, may again be broken up into (1) the theory of the hygiene, sanitation and housing and harboring of armies and navies, (2) actual supply of requirements, food, clothes, ammunition, stores in general, (3) discipline and policing, and (4) the war department as a whole. Or take(*a*.i) educational; here, say,in the department of the microscopist out of innumerable possible lines of study and research, we may distinguish (1) the finding of the specimen, showing desire, (2) the preparation of it by multifarious processes, mechanical and chemical, section-cutting with microtoms, immersion in various solutions, affixing to glass-slides etc., all showing activity, (3) the observation and examination, corresponding to cognition, and (4) the publication of the results. And so on. A little careful consideration will show how cognition, desire, action and summation are always interlacing in endless complication, so that each in every manifestation involves corresponding manifestations of the other two.

with and is therefore not necessary in truth. But from the universal standpoint all and each is equally necessary, for it is all equally present in the I-This-Not, and there is no more reason for any one than for any other in the view of the Whole.

Accepting this absence of finality, a n a v a s- ṭ h ā, 'no-stopping-short, no-standing-still,' as prevailing everywhere, the *Veḍas* and all subservient sciences endeavour to co-ordinate this endless multiplicity of the World-process into a unity. Otherwise, that is to say, if we did not recognise such an endlessness of particulars, and insisted on a mere unity, then no speech at all would be possible; in fact there would be no distinction of knower, knowledge and known, and much less of speaker, speech and spoken about. Speech, the *Veḍas*, are made possible by the fact of the existence of these endless

---

Finally books embodying *knowledge* may be and are written on any and every one of these heads and sub-heads and by appropriate *workers*; and even so are we to understand the compilation of the various parts of Scripture. It may be objected that these divisions and sub-divisions often appear artificial; but this is support instead of refutation. When everything is inextricably mixed up with other things, no hard and fast division is possible. Do not regard these divisions as hard and fast and their artificiality disappears.

particulars; and, therefore, the actuality of these particulars is proved by the possibility of speaking about them. For to impose even the possibility of 'becoming' on what does not really 'become' at some time or other is not right. In the contrary case, it is right and proper to speak of those things as possible (at one time) which do actually 'become' (at some other time).[1] Now the possibility of all things what-

[1] In this argument we may discern the metaphysical reason of the statement in the footnote at page 282 of vol. i of *The Secret Doctrine* that nothing can possibly come into any human consciousness, however weird, fanciful, monstrous, the conception may be, which does not actually exist in the world in some plane of matter or other. And when we further realise that every such conception is itself a 'formulation' a picturing, a copy, in matter of the mental or astral plane, the argument becomes clearer. Herein also we see what element of truth there is in the view of those philosophers who make conceivability a test of truth; also, in the view that every idea or opinion, however erroneous-seeming, which has entered into any human consciousness at all, must because of that fact have some element of truth in it, otherwise it could not have appeared in that consciousness—a view, which, if held more commonly, would bring about the amicable settlement of many controversies that now seem hopeless of adjustment. The analogy between the small human author of a little story and the divine author

soever is implied in the triad of the Self, the Not-Self and the Not-Not-Self, that is to say, in the affirmation of the I, its denial, and the denial of that denial; and we accordingly find that all these bhāvas, possibilities, 'becomings,' which are so implied in these three are actually manifested and are also described in the *Vedas*, etc., by Mahā Vishṇu, Vishṇu, Brahmā, Shiva, Shakṭi, etc.

In this description, as indicated before, the root and essence of the whole World-process naturally comes first, and that is the transcendental fact indicated by the *Praṇava*. Then

---

of a great world-drama is very close. See *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*, ii. 16, Vyāsa's *Yoga-Bhāṣhya*, iii. 14, and *The Science of Peace*, p. 123. In most of the Purāṇas, the 'universal' facts, materials or contents of the World-process are described in the terms of *Sāṅkhya*, and are designated as अबुद्धिपूर्वःसर्गोऽयम्, the 'automatic or mechanical' evolution, that is to say dependent only on the All-consciousness, and independent of the consciousness of any particular individual Īshvara, whose particular world-system, world-egg, brahmāṇḍa, becomes his बुद्धिपूर्वःसर्गः conscious or deliberate formation.

As the Arabian doctors taught, all that is conceivable already *is*, in the All, whether or not it be in manifestation at any time and place. That which is not always existent, has no possible nor conceivable existence, cannot be imagined or

comes the subtle seed-ideation of Mahā-Vishṇu embodied in the *Gāyatṛī* and the *Mahā-vākyas*. Thereafter we have, as embodied in the *Vedas*, the expansion of that ideation, still in the way of universal principles, by the ideations of Vishṇu, Brahmā and Shiva, in pursuance of the instructions of Mahā-Vishṇu. Then follow the varieties of prakāra, method, law, that is to say, a further descent into details; and these are intended to be explained by the sixteen *Brāhmaṇas*.

In the first *Brāhmaṇa* of the *Ṛg-veḍa* is contained the ideation of Vishṇu relating to jñāna,

---

thought of. Every conceivable thing exists in eternity, and appears and disappears in time and space, becomes and vanishes; but has always Being. Out of the all any Īshvara chooses the materials, for his system, and within that system there can only appear such of the contents of the All as he has selected for possible manifestation in a particular time and place, his amsha, portion. Thus looked at the 'reason' for the existence of any particular phenomenon—an elephant, an octopus, a gnat, a planet—is exactly the same as the 'reason' for the existence of any other; each one *is*, and it 'becomes' when selected for manifestation by an Īshvara, or, within his selection, by any self-conscious being in his world-system. A genius is only a man who draws more largely than his fellows on the ever-existing store. (A.B.)

cognition or knowledge. 'Vishṇu instructed his subordinate departmental officers thus: There are four *Brāhmaṇas*, and there are four subdivisions of knowledge too. First, cognition proper, the connecting of everything with or in or by means of knowledge; this is the aham-buḍḍhi, the I-consciousness. Second, cognition within or succeeded by action; the projection of the self into an act. Third, cognition concerned with desire; the consciousness that the I should be known and that the This should also be known; in other words, the 'making' or feeling of desire between the I and the This. Fourth, cognition relating to summation; after having known the I, and felt desire, enter on action; for where else can the desire of the I reside, exist, become manifest, find free play, than in action and cognition; after having known the I, known desire, and known action are the three summed up in life-work.' Because of all this is the work of Vishṇu and of his sub-hierarchs said to be the work of preservation, pālana; the fulfilling of the desire for anything that appears anywhere in the I, as may be necessary, is pālana. This is also the reason for the public tradition that Vishṇu is pervasive of all creatures and ever abides with each. It is true that every jīva constantly makes seemingly independent efforts; 'I have done this, not you; I am so-and-so while you are not; I am a chief,

a king, a learned man, an artist, etc.' But all this is the utterance of the illusory consciousness of aham-kāra, I-ness, individuality, egoism. In reality Vishṇu is the mover, inspirer and propeller of this jīva, (*i.e.*, of all jīvas within his world-system. 'All this is by the amsha, portion, of Vishṇu,' *i.e.*, all this consciousness of self-effort in jīvas is but participation in the life of Vishṇu.[1] The work of preservation that takes place in every atom takes place because of his presence there. Vishṇu first cognises himself: I am the ruler, and rules ought to be made by me. This may be said to be knowledge within knowledge, knowledge about knowledge, cognition inclusive of other cognitions. Having thus ideated, or formulated

[1] This will be clear to the reader when he has mastered the significance of individualities within individualities, cells within tissues, tissues within organs, organs within persons and so on. (See *The Science of Peace*, p. 216.) He will then see that Vishṇu's consciousness of self-effort, 'initiative,' is also illusory with reference to the consciousness of Mahā-Vishṇu and so on, endlessly. From the transcendental or paramārṭha standpoint the World-process is mechanical, automatic, carried on by one Autos, the One Will of the Universal Self; from the empirical or vyavahāra standpoint, each of the endless movements of any world-system is initiated by the individual will of some one self or another. Etymologically Vishṇu means the pervador.

his laws, he cognises the aṇu, the 'small' or the atom: This atom is subordinate to me. Such is the consciousness of the This; it is knowledge as regards the element of action, eṭaṭ; it is active or actional cognition. Thirdly, he cognises the desire of the atom: This atom has such and such a need or necessity. This is knowledge with respect to the element of Negation, desire; it is volitional cognition. Lastly, even when the thought is of the nature of affirmation, 'is,' even then the negation 'is not' is also present; for the question has been 'is it or is it not necessary,' and after having determined this question in the affirmative he satisfies the desire. And this is knowledge with respect to the summation, summative or summational cognition.

We see the same processes in daily human life. Every man first cognises, acquires knowledge about, his work or business, what he wants to do; then about his 'necessary cause' or the necessary means that only will enable him to carry out his work; then of the relation of the things or objects involved in that work with himself, *i.e.*, he finds out how he stands in respect of those things and how or in what way his business will be helped or hindered[1] by them. And so on.

[1] To take a concrete case: I first determine that I would like to go to such and such a place; then I

Knowledge of these various kinds, all the element of cognition, in all its varieties, is thus expounded in the *Brāhmaṇas*. For instance, it is shown there that there is a triplicity in ā k ā-s h a, the cognition-element being called c h i ḍ-ā k ā s h a, the action-element m a h ā-k ā s h a, the desire-element ā k ā s h a proper; the summation being the p a ṛ-ā k ā s h a.[1] Further, each sub-division has its own corresponding sub-division of the property of sound which belongs to this element, *viz.*, p a r ā, p a s h y a n ṭ ī, m a ḍ h-y a m ā and v a i k h a r ī; more details on which subject are to be sought in the science of language. The element of cognition in this triad of ā k ā s h a s and their summation, what the use or purpose and application of cognition is in this aspect of ā k ā s h a, by what law it *is* cognition—all this is determined and made clear by the *Ṛg-Veḍa-Brāhmaṇa*. The other elements, two

---

find out whether road, rail, ship or other is the best means; then, what things will be requisite or useful on the journey; then I take into consideration the whole of these and, if everything is satisfactory, I decide to entertain the wish and finally proceed to carry it out.

[1] In extant Samskṛṭ literature, many of the so-called minor Upaniṣhaṭs and also the *Yoga-Vāsiṣhtha* mention different kinds of ā k ā s h a. In some, five kinds are distinguished, and the names vary also.

preceding and four succeeding ākāsha, are similarly treated.

There are seven elements, on the general principle (which, as said before, governs the number of the *Aṅgas* and the *Upāṅgas*) of the sub-division of the triad of cognition, etc., by two. These two elements, mahaṭ and buḍḍhi, that are not commonly known, are matter of yoga, not for daily life, and are dealt with in the *Veḍas* only for the use of those who have to carry on the processes of the world by means of archetypes, samsāra-rūpa-ṭaṭṭva (?). The cognitive element in each of these, in its subtle as well as gross aspects is described in the *Brāhmaṇa*: What is the work of chiḍ-ākāsha in the element of vāyu, what is chiḍ-vāyu, what is the relation between the three vāyus, what effects are produced on or in ṭejas by chiḍ-vāyu and chiḍ-ākāsha, what is chiṭ ṭejas, what is the relation between its three sub-divisions, and so on with regard to the other successive elements.

There are similarly four *Brāhmaṇas* in the *Yajur-veḍa* dealing with the factor of kriyā or action.

Brahmā plans out all action and instructs his subordinate hierarchs therein thus: 'The first sub-division of action is that which bases on cognition; the second is devoted to desire; the

third is action proper; and the fourth is of the nature of summation. All the office-bearers of our department of work are followers of Vishṇu; you should obtain the necessary knowledge from him or his department and carry out your actions accordingly'. And the sub-hierarchs of Brahmā obtain their information from the sub-hierarchs of Vishṇu of the corresponding grades, even as in daily human life people establish relationships with their equals in respect of knowledge, activity, wishes and inclinations, and condition in life as a whole.[1]

The first sub-division or cognitional action is the recognition of oneself as an actor; this is the element of Vishṇu, mere cognition; also the cognition of the truth about the performance and the instruments of performance of action, *viz.*, such and such are the methods and such the successive steps of the performance of such an action, such the rules and conditions under which the action can be undertaken and the methods followed, etc.; all this is action in the aspect of cognition. Then, in the second place, we have the desire-aspect of action, 'I have obtained knowledge of the matter, I should now take

[1] Compare the significance of modern administrative terms and things corresponding to these terms: 'bureau of information', 'despatching office,' 'weeding department', 'public works department,' etc.

action'; this is the activity of desire, desire-action. Thirdly, there is the action proper, the active conduct after feeling the desire and ascertaining the necessity for the action. In the action, again, all these are summed up, and so we have the fourth aspect, that of summation. Actual action, action proper, stands between the desire and the summation and implies the latter, that is to say, all four aspects, thus: 'I am Brahman, the actor; this is the present need or necessity; to fulfil it I do this; this is done by me'.

All this is taught in the *Brāhmaṇa* of the *Yajur-veḍa*. And therein are also described and set forth the actional sub-divisions of the mahaṭ and buḍḍhi elements, and of ākāsha, *viz.*, the mahā-kāsha, and also of the other elements, and their respective functions, their mutual relations, their fields of activity, and the results produced by that activity in gross and subtle aspects, with all their permutations and combinations.

The four sub-divisions of desire should be studied in the *Brāhmaṇa* of the *Sāma-veḍa*. (1) The desire to know; whence (2) the desire to possess; thereafter (3) the desire to secure possession, *i. e.*, to take the necessary steps, the action, that will bring possession; and finally (4) the attainment—these respectively are the four

sub-divisions, cognitive-desire, desire-proper, active-desire and summation-desire.

The ruler of desire is Shiva and his instruction to his sub-hierarchs takes this shape: Behold, our work is the work of destruction. The order and the way thereof are these. This should be destroyed first, this afterwards; and such and such work of the nature of negation should be performed. First, make enquiry, entertain the 'desire to know,' and thoroughly and fully understand the nature of the I and the This. Then entertain the desire to possess, 'I shall obtain the This and the I'. Having obtained them, you will pass on to the Negation, to the declaration, 'no (I want them no more)'. In the Negation is the summation, sam-ā-hāra, 'bringing all together' and it is the sam-hāra also, the 'taking all in,' re-absorption, destruction.

All these sub-divisions should be studied in the subtle and the gross, (the psychical or subjective and the material or objective aspects), with reference to the desire-sub-divisions of the various root-elements, as in the case of the cognitional and actional sub-divisions thereof.

After all these have been learnt (and study of them completed and experience exhausted, for the time being,) the Negation is entered upon. Pralaya begins with the desire-sub-division of

p ṛ ṭ h v ī and all the others are destroyed successively in order. This process is universal and may be observed in each atom, *viz.*, first the working of desire qualified by knowledge, then attainment, then destruction.[1] Psychologically, contempt, insult, disrespect, hostility, altercation, detraction, slander, anger, etc., (the negative or destructive sides of the emotional life), are all included in desire.

All these matters are made plain in the *Brāhmaṇa* of the *Sāma-Veḍa*.

Finally we have the same four sub-divisions under the summation, and with respect to them Mahā-Vishṇu instructs his sub-hierarchs:[2] 'First

---

1 Cf. anabolism, optimum, and katabolism, all included in metabolism.

2 One would have thought that the sub-hierarchs of Mahā-Vishṇu were only Brahmā, Vishṇu and Shiva; but it seems that just as (looking from the v y a v a h ā r a or empirical standpoint) consciousness is something more than its three aspects, an organism more than all the organs, so the summation is not merely the simple total of the other three, but something over and above, and the *Aṭharva* not a mere binding together into one volume of the three other *Veḍas* but something which includes them and further explains and schematises them. Accordingly, for the working of the *Aṭharva*, Mahā-Vishṇu takes a place as it were by the side of the three gods and has separate sub-hierarchs also. See the statements as to the Tetractys, in *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. iii.

comes the securing of knowledge with its four sub-divisions of (*a*) the wish to know, corresponding with desire, (*b*) the intimation of this wish to some one else able to fulfil it, corresponding to action, (*c*) the development within oneself of the necessary qualification, a ḍ h i k ā r a, authority, right, title, for the obtaining of the needed knowledge, corresponding to cognition, and (*d*) the attainment of the knowledge, corresponding to the summation. Secondly, we have desire with its four sub-divisions of (*a*) knowledge of the pleasantness of a thing, (*b*) the desire to obtain it because of the pleasantness, (*c*) the search for the means of acquisition, and (*d*) the acquisition. Thirdly, there is action, (*a*) the desire to do, (*b*) the desire to find out the means of action, (*c*) the action and (*d*) the wish to give up, to cease from action, renunciation.

In the commonest compound, the compound shows attributes unmanifest in its constituent factors. Oxygen and hydrogen yield, as compound, water, and water has properties which are not found in its constituent gases. Nitrogen, most inert of elements, united with chlorine, quiet enough by itself, gives compounds that explode with a tremor, or with the touch of a feather. Innumerable instances might be given to show that a summation is more than its parts, the reason therefor apparently being that the 'organism' is inhabited by a j ī v a of a higher grade in manifestation than those which inhabit the 'organs' which make it up.—A. B.

Finally we have the summation with its (*a*) wish to know, (*b*) wish to acquire, (*c*) wish to act, and (*d*) the act.

All these matters, the desire to know, to acquire, to do, to abandon, the doing, the results, one's own condition, the significance of own, another, this, thou, I, which, him, all, if, then, because, therefore, wherefore, from all, mine, thine, his, before, after, earlier, later, etc.—all this should be studied in the *Aṭharva-Veḍa* (*Brāhmaṇa*).

Without the *Brāhmaṇas* it is impossible to understand the *Veḍas*. They have been specially formulated for the separate enunciation of all the main laws of the World-process. And so long as the convergence and divergence, the separate effects as well as the interworking of these laws is not understood, so long will the formation of new worlds remain impossible.

The following are the opening sentences of the four *Brāhmaṇas* of the four *Veḍas* respectively; each is also the root-aphorism which indicates the principal or predominant subject-matter of its *Brāhmaṇa* and also the nature of its connexion with its *Veḍa*.

(*a*) Aham ṭaṭṭvam aparam.

(*b*) Prasṭhiṭam pūrvāparam kṛṭam akṛṭam kāraṇa-karṭṛkam.

(*c*) Na evam na cha eṭaṭ pratyāshā samāḍhyasṭham cha ananvayam brahma-ṭaṭṭvam akhilam.

(*d*) Kriyā—guṇa—ḍharma—sampaṭṭi-sāḍhana—lakshaṇam alakshaṇam cha samāhṛṭam.[1]

The principle embodied in each of these mūla-vākyas, root-sentences, governs the rest of the work; and throughout the *Brāhmaṇas* every successive minor or subordinate logion is formulated in genetic consonance with the root-logion, and each word of each such minor logion also conforms to the same rule of consonance.

To recapitulate a little. Mahā-Vishṇu first obtains or receives the AUM. He ideates it and finds that there is a succession within the successionless, the transcendent. To discover the details of that succession he studies the *Mahā-veḍas* which, again, are the ideation of some one else, for the series and succession of

[1] These sentences are wholly unintelligible without commentary, which the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* does not supply; hence they have been left untranslated. At the time of the dictation of the work, in the hurry of it, I unfortunately omitted (so far as I can now remember) to ask him to supply the needed interpretation from some of the other works which he said he had by heart, *e. g.*, Gobbili's *Tīkā* on the *Praṇava-Vāḍa* itself.

rulers is endless. After having mastered the essence of the *Mahā-vedas* and so become Brahman, he enters on the construction of this samsāra in a series of brahmāṇdas. For this purpose there arises within him further ideation in accordance with the *Mahā-vedas.* The steps and stages thereof are somewhat as follows: 'In what manner is this possible? It has been made clear to us that the formation of a samsāra is our duty. These are the various ways of doing it. In which one of these ways or orders is it fit for me to engage in this work?' All this deliberation is symbolised as sleeping in the kṣhīra-sāgara, the 'ocean of milk'. The condition of reflectiveness is the 'ocean of milk'. Kṣhīra signifies the stainless. Mahā-Viṣhṇu is stainless relatively, by comparison with us. This relativity must never be lost sight of. As has been said before, as an atom of our world-system is to the Mahā-Viṣhṇu thereof, so is Mahā-Viṣhṇu in turn to a greater being; and as an atom is to our world-system so is that whole world-system to a larger one, so that literally worlds are hidden in atoms and atoms in worlds again endlessly. And even so is the condition of Mahā-Viṣhṇu's stainlessness comparative. In this condition, this sāgara or ocean of stainlessness, the thought about the creation of a new world arises. Hence is it also called the bhava-sāgara; bhavana means becoming,

coming into existence, and pertains to a v a s ṭ h ā or condition ; 'a thing becomes' means 'comes out of one condition into another condition'.

(Another interpretation however of the word b h a v a-s ā g a r a is the tumultuous ocean of birth and death and rebirth from which escape is so difficult; and hence we find such statements as these :) Beholding this most fearful b h a v a-s ā g a r a, one shore of which is the endless and the other shore the transcendent, and which is studded with the rocky islands of world-systems on which the hapless j ī v a is flung about and bruised and battered by the overwhelming waves of k a r m a helplessly, the terrified and despairing j ī v a cries out to the ruler thereof: 'Save me, save me, take me across, O Bearer of the Discus!' Yet such is the cry of only him who knows the This alone and not also the Self and the Negation. He who knows the three has no need to cry out thus. He knows and says: 'As thou art, so am I, so are all these others. There is no crossing and no saving here. By the path by which thou hast arrived at thy estate, by that same path shall I arrive there too. Such is the law, and it must be fulfilled'. Thus, indeed, to know the three is to be saved.

Under these circumstances the use and justification of hymns, prayers, etc., is but this, *viz.*, that he who is the ruler of this world-system is

our chief, and when we say to him, 'save us,' we mean only that he should make plain to us the means of crossing over, the way by which we could go over to the place he himself occupies. For he who has trodden a path to a goal, he and he only knows all about the path, and from him only is it fitting to receive knowledge and instruction about it. It is true that the manner of treading that path is explained in the *Veḍas* and the subsidiary sciences, and attainment of the goal will surely follow upon the *practice* of it; but (to study a work is also to appeal to its author for information and to receive it from him, and moreover) the practice cannot be had without making known the desire for it to those who can teach it. All kinds of knowledge are, no doubt, written down in the books, as 'this is so and this is so'. But the one so and the other so are not realised except in and by practice. The mere knowledge is fruitless. And knowledge can be put into practice only with the help of a competent guide. Thus, if an inhabitant of one country wishes to travel to another he may find out from written books in what direction from his own this other country lies, what other lands, rivers and oceans intervene, what roads and routes are available and so forth; yet it will be necessary for him to consult others who have

actually made the journey, for confirmation or correction of the information contained in the book; and, more, after he has received such confirmation, to seek for a companion and assistant to go with him to the desired place. It is true that sometimes persons start by themselves, without companions; but even so, they meet with companions on the road later on; and in any case, these are exceptional instances falling under special laws.

In this sense, then, the jīva may and should appeal for help to those who have trodden this path to mukṭi or to the ruler of the system. For all are the helpers of all, and all may appeal for help to all, and all may teach all, according to their needs and abilities, turn by turn. This is the virtue and significance of saṭ-saṅga, the company of the good; and such saṭ-saṅga only is the fruit of knowledge; for all are in essence equal and indeed the same. Otherwise, indeed, to know and not to know were the same. Knowledge is for this only that all may profit thereby, and this is rightly so and must be so, for knowledge, consciousness, is universal, and the Knower to whom it belongs is also universal.

When it is said that Mahā-Vishṇu *sleeps* in his nirmala-sāgara, his 'pellucid and stainless ocean' or condition, it is not meant that he is

inactive. As said before, utter cessation of action never takes place.[1]

Activity is as inseparable from all conditions as the affix ḍ ā, (indicative of the incessant movement of time) is inseparable from the prefixes k a, ṭ a, y a, etc., (indicative of special conditions) in the words k a ḍ ā, ṭ a ḍ ā, y a ḍ ā, when, then, whenever, (at what time, at that time, at whichever time) etc. So, even during sleep, Mahā-Vishṇu, preoccupied with thoughts of extensive operations, revolves in mind the various methods thereof. S h e ṣ h a, (literally the 'remainder' and mythologically the thousand-headed serpent who forms the couch of Mahā-Vishṇu) is space. Because all is endless and transcendent, space is such also. In that area of space wherever there was or is a world-system, that portion is taken up, 'bound,' occupied and unavailable. What *remains*

---

[1] Activity on one plane is consonant with rest on another. The j ī v a is tireless, but the vehicles tire and wear out. Hence, that the body may sleep, the j ī v a, leaving it, energises another vehicle, and is active through it on another plane. And also, Mahā-Vishṇu, sleeping in the ocean, is active in ideation on the creative plane, and the result is the growth of the Lotus, and the appearance of Brahmā, the creator on the planes of manifestation. (A.B.)

unoccupied is the s h e ṣ h a, and in that Mahā-Vishṇu sleeps, *i.e.*, 'works,' 'ideates,' 'dreams'. Whence the tradition that 'the Lord, sleeping in the ocean of milk, creates this world'. Sleeping with Lakṣhmī by his side signifies the presence of desire. Because desire is omnipresent therefore Mahā-Vishṇu, possessed with it, performs his ideation in this remnant of space, desiring to create. Vishṇu is born there, that is to say, an atom by evolution attains to that condition and receives a place near Mahā-Vishṇu, by devotion to him. To him the instruction is given: 'Do you perform the work of cognition'. Then Brahmā arises in the same way and is directed to perform all action. Finally, Shiva is born and taught to deal with desire. For himself Mahā-Vishṇu reserves the function of 'holding together all,' the summation. The primary ideation is the *Gāyaṭrī*[1]; the separate special instructions,

1 The nature and significance of the *Gāyaṭrī* have been attempted to be explained in previous footnotes. With reference to those it may be asked, 'When the *Gāyaṭrī* is the effort of the ordinary human j ī v a to put itself in rapport with the Solar Logos, what can it mean in the mouth of the Solar Logos himself; what is meant by saying that *his* first ideation is the *Gāyaṭrī*?'. This is only another illustration of the continuum we meet with everywhere. In the mouth or mind of our Mahā-Vishṇu

the *Mahā-vākyas*; the detailed exposition, the *Veḍas*. After receiving the detailed exposition, Viṣhṇu, Brahmā and Shiva entered on their respective functions. And when the work grew in their hands, they felt the need of and appointed subordinate workers. To these subordinates they expounded their own further ideations, and these are the *Brāhmaṇas*.

When it is said that summation is the work of Mahā-Viṣhṇu it should not be understood that he has only this and no other work. He has his own special work under the instructions of his own superior Mahā-Viṣhṇu, and also holds together his subordinate three gods. To his own Mahā-Viṣhṇu, our Mahā-Viṣhṇu is only one of many subordinates, Mahā-Shiva, Mahā-Brahmā, etc., even as Brahmā or Viṣhṇu or Shiva is to him. It is not known to us whether he is specially devoted to cognition or action or desire,

---

the *Gāyaṭrī* would mean *his* effort to put himself in rapport with *his superior* Logos. The *Gāyaṭrī* expresses, so to say, a law, an abstraction, the concrete applications and illustrations of which are on all possible scales, infinitesimal as well as pseudo-infinite, as ought to be and is the case with all true laws of nature. The constant flow of life from parent to child along the whole endless course is the primary law of all 'creation,' and hence the *Gāyaṭrī* which expresses this flow is rightly the first ideation.

for our knowledge does not reach up to that stage. Because all powers appear in him, so far as our world-system is concerned, therefore we may infer that he has the office, the duty and the right of producing all three. It is declared in the *Mahā-vedas* however that this our Mahā-Vishṇu is the cognition-official of the superior Mahā-Vishṇu as the lord of summation.

But all this need not be discussed here, for such discussion is useless for us. It is enough for us to know that the transcendent B r a h m a n is embodied in the universal AUM wherein the knowledge of endless Mahā-Vishṇus is included and lies latent. Become we first like our Mahā-Vishṇu; then will be time to think of higher reaches. That this matter has been touched on here at all is only to further illustrate and emphasise the endlessness that prevails everywhere in the World-process, because of the infinity of the Absolute B r a h m a n.

Note :—The names of only a few of the *Brāhmaṇas* are now current; the better known are the *Aiṭareya* or *Āshvalāyana* and the *Kaushīṭakī* or *Sāṅkhyāyana* of the *Ṛk*; *Shaṭapaṭha* of the *Yajuh*; *Pañcha-vimsha*, *Shad-vimsha* and *Tāndya* of the *Sāma*; and *Go-paṭha* of the *Aṭharva*. The text mentions the *Go-paṭha* and the *Saṭ-paṭha*. The modern spelling, it will be noticed, is *Shaṭa-paṭha* (the 'hundred-branched,' 'of the hundred-paths') in place of *Saṭ-paṭha* (the 'good-path').

That is not compassed by the *Brāhmaṇas*,
With all their wealth of comment and detail;
No great-word and no root-word may enclose
The ever-swelling greatness of the Self.
Yet, in this seething ocean of the world,
With currents of succession ordered well,
And lawless-rushing billows of turmoil,
Shoreless, with one long shore of endlessness,
Another of transcendence,—our sole hope,
Haven of rest, the Sameness of the Self!

ॐ

शुभमस्तु सर्वजगताम्
सर्वो भद्राणि पश्यतु
लोकाः समस्ताः सुखिनो भवन्तु

90

ॐ

PEACE TO ALL BEINGS.

End of Vol. I.